

THE CHRISTIAN REFORMER.

No. CXLIII.]

NOVEMBER, 1856.

[VOL. XII.

WARDLAW AND YATES.*

WE commenced the perusal of Dr. Alexander's *Life of Wardlaw* with the full intention of using it as the occasion of a review of Dr. Wardlaw's general character and proceedings. We have not, however, found in the book the kind of assistance we expected. It possesses very little biographical interest, and the little it does possess is presented in a most unimpressive form. It is a book wanting in the natural taste and feeling appropriate to the case, but burdened with commonplace expositions of the religious matters with which its subject was connected. Not only is it composed with an exclusive adaptation to the views of that sectarian circle in which its author moves, but it abounds in what may be called the cant of this sect to an extraordinary degree. It is, moreover, made the medium of conveying Dr. Alexander's own opinions so obtrusively, that we can scarcely dismiss the idea that the biographer himself is the chief object in favour of whom our attention is demanded.

Under these circumstances, we have found ourselves obliged to abandon our original design, and to confine our notice to that part of these Memoirs which relates to the Unitarian controversy in which Dr. Wardlaw was engaged. This topic could scarcely be passed by in a journal devoted, as ours is, to the interests of Unitarianism. It will be seen that, in our remarks upon it, we shall have principally to do with the writer of the account, and a specimen will be thus afforded of the method we must have adopted had we undertaken the examination of the whole volume. Dr. Alexander rather than Dr. Wardlaw would have been forced upon our observation.

Our readers must be well aware that Dr. Wardlaw conducted the orthodox side of one of the most remarkable discussions of the principles of Unitarianism that have happened in modern times. The commencement of this discussion is thus described :

"In the beginning of 1813, however, being anxious to select some suitable subject for a course of lectures to be delivered once a month on the Sabbath evening in his chapel, he was induced to fix upon the subject of our Lord's Divinity and Atonement, partly because he had the materials for a course on that subject partially collected, partly because through the efforts of the Unitarians in Glasgow public attention was

* Memoirs of the Life and Writings of Ralph Wardlaw, D.D. By William Lindsay Alexander, D.D. Edinburgh—Adam and Charles Black. 1856.

already directed to the questions at issue between them and the evangelical churches. He accordingly announced a course of lectures on this subject, and delivered the first on the evening of the first Sabbath in March. The interest excited by these lectures was great; more especially as Mr. Yates, the Unitarian minister, was in the habit of attending on Mr. Wardlaw's lectures and replying to his statements on a subsequent evening in his own chapel. Very much against the wishes of the pastor of Albion Street Chapel he was thus compelled to assume the appearance of a polemic who was engaged in a series of regular pitched battles with an antagonist. Disagreeable as this was, however, he felt that having once entered the arena he must hold on unflinchingly in his defence of the truth. To mitigate as much as possible the appearance of intentional conflict, as well as from some conscientious scruples about joining or seeming to join in worship with Unitarians, he did not return the compliment of going to Mr. Yates's chapel to hear his lectures. This exposed him in some quarters to a charge of illiberality, under which, however, he sat very easily."*

In this representation it seems to be implied, that Mr. Yates would have best consulted the proprieties of the contest if he had abstained from attending Dr. Wardlaw's lectures, and had not replied to them as they were delivered. It was, however, just as much the duty of Mr. Yates to reply to the attack which was made upon his views of Christianity, as it could be the duty of Dr. Wardlaw to engage in that attack. It was manifestly right that the reply should be given at the time when the attack was offered, and in the form in which it appeared. Nothing could be more indicative and promotive of fairness in the business, than that the person intending to reply should personally acquaint himself with the statements he had to meet. However "disagreeable" this was to Dr. Wardlaw, he must have calculated upon the disagreeableness, unless he had supposed either that his antagonist would shrink from the contest he had invited, or would abstain from taking the most honourable measures in preparation for that contest. To complain or to feel aggrieved when your opponent does that which is necessary to reduce his opposition to its truest terms, is to betray, if not a distrust of your cause, yet a desire that you should benefit by the non-exhibition of the real merit of that cause. Dr. Wardlaw is undoubtedly injured by this imputation of irritated feeling in a case which ought to have called forth his unmingled commendation. If he, for the reasons stated, was unable to attend Mr. Yates's lectures, it was so much the worse for him. He did not, by reason of his absence, stand so fairly toward his opponent as his opponent stood toward him. He suffered that opponent in this respect to gain a moral advantage over him. When we take into account the "conscientious scruples" which are pleaded on his behalf, we must pronounce this disadvantage to be simply unfortunate. But although its subject might "sit very easily" under a "charge

* *Memoirs of Wardlaw*, pp. 149, 150.

of illiberality," considering what the claims of his conscience were, there was another charge—that of not being so well furnished with Mr. Yates's side of the argument as Mr. Yates was with his—under which we hope he did not so easily sit.

We mark this false position occupied by Dr. Wardlaw—of whose nature Dr. Alexander appears to be altogether unconscious—because we are afraid the evil is inherent in such a case as is here presented. When a man assumes in a theological controversy of this kind, that his antagonist's opinions are out of the pale of that Christianity whose truths are the matter of dispute, and entertains "conscientious scruples" as to allowing him the privileges of a common Christian brotherhood, he is so far disqualified from placing himself in those circumstances of equal judgment which conduce to the just settlement of the questions he discusses. This disqualification operates much more extensively than to anything that can be included in the expression of "not returning the compliment."

We proceed with our author's narrative.

"Mr. Wardlaw's course was no sooner finished than he received numerous and urgent applications to commit his discourses to the press. With this request he complied, and in the preparation of them for publication all his spare time during the ensuing winter was occupied. They appeared in an octavo volume in the spring of 1814, and were immediately welcomed by the public both in Scotland and England as a most seasonable, lucid and convincing defence of the fundamental doctrines of the Christian system. In the reviews of the day the volume was commended in the strongest terms, and the author received from many quarters letters of thanks and praise that must have afforded him peculiar gratification and encouragement."*

"Of a work so generally known and which has now attained the rank of one of the standard books of British theology it is unnecessary to offer here any analysis; and any but the shortest critique upon it would be out of place. Suffice it, therefore, to say that whilst it is more popular in its cast, and has less of learning and force than the nearly contemporary works of Horsely and Magee, it is inferior to neither of them in clearness and cogency of reasoning, and is greatly superior to both in suavity of manner, grace of diction, fulness of scriptural illustration, and depth and unction of spiritual feeling. At the time it appeared it was very much the work that was wanted in this country no less than in America, to counteract the effect on the popular mind of such writings as those of Priestley, Lindsay and Belsham. If the different ground now assumed by Unitarians, who no longer make a fashion of appealing to Scripture as an objective standard of religious truth, but would draw all from within and submit all to a purely subjective test, have rendered it less important in a polemical point of view, to the scientific theologian who is concerned to estimate all the forms of religious opinion that have prevailed among men by their relation to the written Word of God, and to the practical Christian who is desirous to possess clear and correct conceptions of revealed truth both in its

* *Memoirs of Wardlaw*, pp. 150, 151.

principle and in its application, the book will continue to possess a more than common value."*

When we read the phrase, "the nearly contemporary works of Horsley and Magee," we could scarcely believe that we had caught the words aright. So startling an anachronism in a matter with which he might be supposed to be familiar, seemed to exceed even the incorrectness which our past experience had taught us to associate with Dr. Alexander's statements. Horsley's "work" consists of Tracts in controversy with Dr. Priestley, which were, as stated on the title-page of the collected edition, published in the years 1783-84-86. Between the last of these periods and the year 1814, in which Wardlaw's Discourses appeared, twenty-eight years had elapsed. Horsley died eight years, and Priestley ten years, before those Discourses came out. All this, a man who professes to classify works on the Unitarian controversy ought to have known; but inasmuch as Dr. Alexander did not know it, he should have restrained himself from fixing his ignorance in the form of the positive mistake, that the works of Horsley and Wardlaw were "nearly contemporary." It is worthy of a passing reference in this connection, that the names both of Horsley and Lindsey are, in the paragraph quoted above, wrongly spelt.

Can it be attributed to the same general spirit of incorrectness which produced the errors just noticed, that we are told that "Unitarians no longer make a fashion of appealing to Scripture as an objective standard of religious truth, but would draw all from within, and submit all to a purely subjective test"? Whatever the cause of it may be, the assertion is notoriously contrary to fact. It will be observed that the imputation is cast upon Unitarians as such, and that it relates to their use of the Scriptures in connection with their distinctively Unitarian opinions. To the body of Unitarians it has no application in any sense; and, in the sense implied, it has, as far as we know, no application to any individual of that body. Every professed Unitarian would, we believe, consider himself bound to defend his Unitarianism on strictly scriptural grounds, and would employ for that purpose substantially the same arguments as were employed by Mr. Yates in answer to Dr. Wardlaw. The questions discussed by these gentlemen remain now, as they were then considered to be, questions which could only be decided by scriptural evidence; and the different parties to the discussion would still sustain the same position toward the authority of the Scriptures which they formerly sustained. Unitarian writings are continually issuing from the press whose most marked characteristic is, that they "make a fashion of appealing to Scripture;" and the appearance a few years ago of the fourth edition of Yates's *Vindi-*

* Memoirs of Wardlaw, p. 152.

cation, is alone a sufficient indication that his method of appeal is neither abandoned nor discountenanced. The circumstances of this latter republication prove that the work is regarded at the present time as one "of the standard books" of Unitarian theology. We should indeed have little difficulty in shewing that Wardlaw's Discourses are much less adapted to the current thought of modern Orthodoxy, than Yates's Vindication is to the current thought of existing Unitarianism. Dr. Alexander is a Congregational minister residing in Edinburgh, and there is also in that city a Unitarian church. We invite him to try the truth of his representation within his own locality. We are willing to abide by the result of the attempt, as made there, among the Unitarians at his own door, to whom, if to any, his description ought to be indisputably applicable. We promise him, that whatever else he may have to complain of, he shall not have occasion for the complaint that "Unitarians no longer make a fashion of appealing to Scripture as an objective standard of religious truth." It is not a matter of opinion, but of fact, with which he has to do, and we defy him to establish his declaration in connection with the facts immediately under his personal notice.

The publication of Dr. Wardlaw's Discourses was followed, as soon as possible, by Mr. Yates's Reply. In a letter addressed to Dr. Wardlaw before he sent the MS. to press, Mr. Yates offered to submit it to his review. The declared object of this offer was to reduce the controversy to its narrowest limits, and especially to prevent any misunderstanding which might grow up on either side of it. Dr. Wardlaw declined this proposal, and that with considerable force of objection, on the ground that such corrections as he might insert could not properly stand in the relation of an answer to the Reply; it being impossible for him, in that form, to do justice to himself. Although Mr. Yates gave occasion to this objection by having expressed a desire "that the controversy should go no further," we think that Dr. Wardlaw, while declining to pledge himself on that point, might have accepted the offer made to him with great advantage. It was open to him to alter its terms according to his own sense of propriety, and Mr. Yates's real intention would certainly have been fulfilled by any friendly conference that could have been arranged. Dr. Alexander, after quoting at length the correspondence on this subject, indulges himself in these remarks:

"It may be taken as an indication of the sort of man Mr. Wardlaw had to deal with in this controversy, that Mr. Yates actually did publish both these letters in his reply. Most men, after reading Mr. Wardlaw's answer, would have felt that in making such a proposal as Mr. Yates's letter contains, they had done a somewhat foolish thing, and that the best course would be to allow the correspondence to fall into oblivion. But the same indiscretion which had led to the proposal seems to have

prevented the author of it from finding how completely the absurdity of it had been exposed by the party to whom it had been made; while the opportunity of acting before the public the part of a paragon of courtesy, candour and magnanimity, rendered the temptation to print the correspondence, with such comments as Mr. Yates thought most likely to tell, irresistible. The whole accordingly appears at the end of Mr. Yates's volume, and characteristically winds up that performance."*

Thus it is that theological prejudice not only blinds the eyes to the perception of truth, but perverts into faults the very virtues of those against whom it is entertained. Mr. Yates's conduct in this case was marked by a moral simplicity, the possibility of which Dr. Alexander is unable to comprehend. With him such simplicity is "a somewhat foolish thing;" and the revelation of it suggests to him the seizure of an "opportunity of acting before the public." Whether cunning or vanity most prevailed in the business, is matter of doubt to him. The idea of two men engaged in a controversy sitting down to correct each other's mistakes, and mutually to ascertain how the questions of dispute really stand between them, is ridiculous. It is better that they should fight out the dispute with a partial knowledge of each other's intentions. A full understanding might produce concessions which would miserably weaken the vigour of the fight. If the antagonist offered abject submission, the offer might indeed be graciously accepted; but when he merely asks that the two parties should agree as to what is just and friendly, in order to their contending only for the right, he should be treated with contempt. This is certainly the spirit of the passage we have quoted, and it is in a similar spirit that such dicta as the following are conceived:

"No person who reads his volume will rise from it with a very profound sense of the general powers of the author's mind, either as a thinker or as a logician, nor is it possible to divest ourselves of the impression that the moral character of the book is not what it ought to be."†

"A certain tone of jauntiness and petulance also pervades the work, which does not communicate a very pleasing impression of the writer's earnestness, and suggests the idea rather of a party advocate, than of one pleading in defence of what he himself felt to be solid and important truths."‡

"I can understand why men of earnest minds who have swerved from the truth, but are still piously seeking it, should be dealt with gently and persuasively: but when one enters the arena against a thorough-going combatant such as Mr. Yates, I am apt to think that delicacy of this sort may be carried a great deal too far."§

Yes, that is the way! Assume your adversary to be not only wrong, but wicked. Shake your head in a grave and suspicious manner when you allude to the feelings by which he may

* *Memoirs of Wardlaw*, p. 157.

† *Ibid.* p. 158.

‡ *Ibid.* p. 157.

§ *Ibid.* p. 159.

be influenced. Discard gentleness and persuasiveness as delicacies of a sort to which he is not entitled. Thus judging and acting, you may attain to so comfortable a sense of your own superiority, as will render it purely laughable that you could be expected to submit to any terms which imply the possibility on your part of confession or conciliation.

Mr. Yates's volume, entitled *A Vindication of Unitarianism*, was, in due time, succeeded by a reply from Dr. Wardlaw under the title of *Unitarianism incapable of vindication*; and this second attack was again met by Mr. Yates in a *Sequel* to his *Vindication*.

We shall abstain from any remarks upon the merit of this controversy, and shall not enter upon the examination of the opinions which Dr. Alexander has expressed concerning it. It is quite unnecessary that the battle, or any part of it, should be fought over again. We are desirous merely to set right facts which are erroneously stated, and to correct faults of temper which have contributed to such statements. To this we have hitherto confined ourselves, and there is unhappily more of the same work waiting for our hand.

After mentioning the publication of Mr. Yates's *Sequel*, Dr. Alexander says,

"Mr. Wardlaw allowed the *Sequel* to remain without any reply. This silence was peculiarly offensive to Mr. Yates, and he allowed his displeasure to show itself several years afterwards, when on issuing a second edition of his *Sequel* he bitterly complained in an advertisement prefixed to it that his opponent had behaved ungenerously to him, in allowing an accusation which he had refuted to remain unrecalled for six years. As this belongs to the period of Mr. Wardlaw's life now before us, it may be proper to insert here his reply to this complaint, though it did not appear till he issued the fourth edition of his *Discourses* in 1828."*

Immediately after this paragraph, a long extract is given from Dr. Wardlaw's Preface to the fourth edition of his original work. The accusation complained of, though a little softened down, is there still allowed to remain. The precise form of this accusation was, that Mr. Yates had been guilty of "wilful and deliberate misrepresentation." Dr. Wardlaw's Preface is a defence of this charge, and it is quoted by Dr. Alexander to fix the fact of the charge having been persisted in. Nothing more is said on the subject in this part of the *Memoirs*; but in a subsequent part, we have an account of the edition of the *Discourses* from which the extract was taken, that concludes in the following words:

"This edition of the *Discourses*, thus carefully revised and enlarged, was the *fourth*. It constitutes the standard edition of the work; for though others have since appeared, the author made no subsequent alterations upon either text or notes."†

* *Memoirs of Wardlaw*, pp. 161, 162.

† *Ibid.* p. 263.

Thus we have the matter of this accusation represented as closed at the point where the criminating Preface left it. There Dr. Alexander, having taken care to exhibit it formally at that point, dismisses the case with the emphatic declaration that "no subsequent alterations upon either text or notes" was made in the work containing it.

We have now to lay before our readers a quotation from the fourth edition of Mr. Yates's *Vindication*, to which it will be unnecessary for us to solicit their special regard.

"After I had published the preceding observations in the year 1817, I again noticed Dr. Wardlaw's charge of 'wilful and deliberate misrepresentation,' in the Advertisement to the Second Edition of the *Vindication*, A.D. 1818, and also in the Advertisement to the Second Edition of the 'Sequel to the *Vindication*,' A.D. 1822. In the Preface to the Fourth Edition of his *Discourses*, A.D. 1828, Dr. Wardlaw adhered to his representation. This led to a Correspondence in the *Christian Pioneer*, for October and November 1828, and for January and May 1829, and the result of this Correspondence is at length stated by my opponent in the Preface to his Fifth and last Edition, A.D. 1837, in the following very handsome and gratifying terms: 'The mutual explanations in that Correspondence,' says he, 'were so far at least mutually satisfactory, as to determine me to cancel, in the present edition, all that had been said on the subject, and, simply referring the reader (if such an one there be) who may have any portion of curiosity on a point so purely personal, to the Correspondence mentioned, to leave it to oblivion. I heartily concur in the desire expressed by my antagonist, that everything personal or offensive between us 'would be expunged from what we have written.' I would cherish towards him all that personal respect to which his talents and character entitle him; and my worst and best wish for him is, that the powers of his richly endowed mind were, by the Holy Spirit, 'baptized into Christ,' and consecrated to the service of a DIVINE SAVIOUR.' Although I have always considered this retraction of the charge as due to me in fairness and honesty, and requisite in order that any amicable relations might subsist between Dr. Wardlaw and myself, I would now acknowledge with the most sincere and heartfelt pleasure my sense of his candour and kindness. I earnestly wish that I may execute my present task in the same spirit,—a spirit which certainly becomes us both as we draw nearer to our great account."*

So it appears that the parade of the long extract which continued the accusation against Mr. Yates conveys a false impression—false as to Mr. Yates, from whom the accusation had been removed, and false as to Dr. Wardlaw, who desired what he had said to be cancelled. It also appears that the deliberate statement which shuts the reader up to the false impression conveyed, viz., that "no subsequent alterations upon either text or notes" of the fourth edition of the *Discourses* were made, is simply untrue.

Now we are not about to bring against Dr. Alexander a charge of wilful misstatement. In this instance, such a charge

* A *Vindication of Unitarianism*, by James Yates, M.A., Fourth Edition, p. 343, note.

would be a very serious one indeed; for if the misstatement were wilful, it must have been committed in a spirit of fraudulent management which is perfectly atrocious. There is another more venial principle on which we may account for these awkward circumstances, and he shall have the full benefit of it. Ignorance, pure ignorance—that may serve his turn in rebutting the moral charge. But it is ignorance which is just as shameful as it is entire: ignorance remaining where knowledge ought to have been obtained: ignorance demonstrative of incapacity for the task undertaken: ignorance involving the careless betrayal of an intellectual trust: and ignorance obtruded under the pretence of full and accurate information. How easily contented with itself was this ignorance when it could damage a theological foe, and how confidently it completed its work of injury by positively affirming that which it did not know! “The author made no subsequent alterations upon either text or notes.” It is lamentable that ignorance, in trying to prove its competency to instruct, should thus run the risk of affirming the thing that is not. That is a bad sort of ignorance; and we are disposed to apply to it a notable inquiry which Dr. Alexander suggests with regard to those “trials of temper” to which he says Mr. Yates subjected Dr. Wardlaw: “In such a case it is pertinent to ask, whether a good end may not be answered by following the command which the apostle gives in reference to certain persons who were walking disorderly in the early church, to ‘rebuke them sharply that they may be sound in the faith.’”*

We have one more matter to mention before we finish our unpleasant task. During the time of his controversy with Mr. Yates, Dr. Wardlaw was Secretary of the Glasgow Literary and Commercial Society. The circumstances connected with his retirement from the Secretaryship are thus recorded by Dr. Alexander:

“His increasing duties, however, he began to find incompatible with the retention of his place as secretary of that society, and accordingly in April 1816 he tendered his resignation of that office. On this occasion it was moved by Dr. Nimmo and seconded by Mr. Yates that ‘the society do express in a suitable manner the high sense they entertain of the benefit derived from the judicious manner in which he discharged the duties of Secretary, and their deep regret that his arrangements rendered it necessary for him to resign the office;’ and a committee having been appointed to consider and report as to what was a ‘suitable manner’ of expressing the society’s gratitude, the following resolution was in consequence adopted on the 27th of April:—

“‘That the Society express to Mr. Wardlaw their most grateful acknowledgments for his judicious and diligent discharge of the office of Secretary, and for the great advantage derived to the Society from the share taken by him in their discussions, and that as a small testimony of their heartfelt esteem for his character, and gratitude for his services, they request his acceptance of a copy of Wetstein’s Greek Testament,

* *Memoirs of Wardlaw*, p. 159.

having a suitable inscription, or of any similar memorial which it would be agreeable to him to receive.'

"Mr. Wardlaw having declared his preference of the work proposed by the society, a copy of Wetstein's New Testament appropriately bound was sent to him, accompanied by a courteous letter from Mr. Yates who had succeeded him in the Secretaryship. This present bore the following inscription, of which the sentiment is better than the Latinity — '*Viro Reverendo, RODULPHO WARDLAW, Pignus Amicitiae, necnon Animi Grati PROPTER MUNUS SCRIBAE ab illo feliciter et diligentissime exactum, Hocce opus sacrosanctum, D.D.D. SOCIETAS GLASGUENSIS LIT. ET COMM. 1815.*'"

"The sentiment is better than the Latinity." How evidently mean is the animus of that remark! If it was founded in truth, a generous man would, under the circumstances, have suppressed it as a matter of course. A generous man might, indeed, have taken occasion to say a kindly word as to the pleasing form which the relations between these theological opponents assumed, and the endeavour of Mr. Yates to avail himself to the utmost of the opportunity of friendliness presented to him. Such generosity would, however, we suppose, be esteemed by the writer under our consideration as a theological weakness. He therefore more naturally tries to turn the incident before him into a weapon of offence, and, as usual, commits a mistake.

"The sentiment is better than the Latinity." That is all. He does not point out where the Latinity is deficient. Not he! That would be too fair, inasmuch as it might enable an opponent the more easily to expose his pretension. It would be better not to make the assault at all, than to lay himself open to a direct reply. It was safer to leave the exact point of objection in doubt, than to shut up all door of escape from a counter charge by plainly saying what was meant.

"The sentiment is better than the Latinity." We do not pretend to much learning ourselves, although we were sent to school when we were younger. The knowledge we then obtained qualifies us to say that the grammatical construction of the passage is quite correct. Having the opportunity, however, of gratifying our further curiosity the other day, we placed this inscription before a gentleman who would be universally acknowledged as one of the most distinguished scholars of the age. He unhesitatingly told us that there was no fault at all to be found with its Latinity. He added, moreover, that as far as he could conjecture the point of objection, it seemed to him probable that it arose from the imperfect scholarship of the objector. When Dr. Alexander condescends to do Mr. Yates the justice of specifying where it is that his Latinity is imperfect, it will be seen whether this conjectural opinion is actually sustainable or not.

F.

MR. TAYLER ON RELIGION IN GERMANY.

Heidelberg, Sept. 12th, 1856.

MY DEAR SIR,

I SPOKE in my last letter of the reaction that has taken place, especially since the revolutionary movements of 1848 and 1849, against the free teaching (*Lehrfreiheit*) which used to be considered the peculiar privilege of the theological faculties of the German Universities. A very powerful party, with which the conservative tendencies of the upper classes throughout Germany strongly sympathize, but which has its seat chiefly in Berlin, is set on limiting, if not entirely abrogating, this liberty, and reducing the theological faculties from their ancient prerogative of searching for truth with the unconditional freedom essential to proper science (*Wissenschaft*), to the simple condition of auxiliaries to the Church—mere training-schools for preachers, the pledged defenders and propagators of a traditional confessionalism. If this effort should prove successful, it will effectually eliminate theology—as the noblest subject of human thought and inquiry, using history and philosophy as its combined instruments of investigation—from the circle of the sciences, and bring it down to the rank of a scholastic technicality, ever moving within a prescribed sphere of given ideas—the art of keeping men's minds within a beaten, hereditary track of thought and action. Already, as I have before remarked, an alienation is perceptible, among the best order of minds, from the study of theology. I trust there will be found sufficient energy and courage to resist and overcome this deadening, despotic influence; but the next few years will put the religious liberties and the theological life of Germany to a severe test. Heidelberg still retains much of the spirit of ancient freedom; Baden was for years the principal focus of German liberalism. The young Independent minister to whom I referred in my last letter, told me, he could perceive a wide difference between the mental atmosphere of Heidelberg and that of Berlin. Yet in Heidelberg itself, and even in Tübingen which is freer still, the reactionary influences are beginning to be felt. A Professor has recently been appointed in the last-mentioned University, whose conservative spirit is meant to counteract the tendency of the school of Baur. Ullmann whose name is well known to all readers of German theology as one of the conductors of the *Theologische Studien und Kritiken*, originally set on foot by Schleiermacher,—who was for many years a professor in Heidelberg, and regarded as one of the most accomplished representatives of the moderately liberal and quietly progressive school,—has been raised to the rank of *Prelat* at Karlsruhe, which places him at the head of the Protestant Church in Baden, and become, under the influences of the time, quite ascetic and reactionary, and broken off all

connection (so one of them informed me) with many of his earlier friends. Schenkel, one of the present theological professors at Heidelberg, whose name was much before the public when I first arrived here, in consequence of the strong measures which he had adopted, as Pro-rector, in putting down the student-associations (an ancient feature of the German Universities, for which Heidelberg was especially remarkable), is said to be a man (I do not speak from personal knowledge) that under great liberality of phrase conceals a strong conservative tendency, on which Government can always rely in an emergency, and to possess an energy and decision of character that gives him the advantage over more liberal, but weaker and less resolute, men. His name is mixed up (how far justly I cannot say, for it happened before my arrival, and it is very difficult to get at the exact truth in these matters) with the secret causes of a transaction which indicates only too plainly the jealous and repressive policy of the present governments. A *Privat-docent*, Kuno Fischer, distinguished, I am assured by various friends, and amongst the rest by M. Bunsen, as the most eminent philosophical genius of the present day in Germany, had drawn crowded audiences to his lectures by the force and clearness of his exposition and his singular gift of eloquence.* He numbered hundreds among his hearers, while some of the older professors could scarcely count half a dozen. Some strong expressions in a lecture which he delivered on Spinoza, excited the alarm of the ecclesiastical party, and manœuvres, commenced against him in Heidelberg and prosecuted at Karlsruhe, the seat of the Government of Baden, procured his deposition,—an act which, till it is reversed here, must effectually close against him the academic career in any other University, and have the effect of condemning to silence during his best and ripest years one of the most gifted teachers of his age. The pen, for quickening influence on young minds, can never wholly replace the action of the living voice. This affair provoked some controversy at the time, in which the celebrated Strauss, now resident in Heidelberg, took part, of course on the side of Fischer. Fischer has just published an excellent work on Lord Bacon, the greater part of which I have already read.† It is perhaps the first German treatise in which full justice is done to our great English philosopher. It points out with admirable clearness the worth and limits of his system; traces its influence on the subsequent line of English philosophers from Hobbes and Locke to Berkeley and Hume; indicates its relation to Leibnitz and Wolf on one hand, and to the sensualist school of France on the other; and shews how its

* Men of this standing are allowed to teach in the German Universities, and thus prepare themselves for future professorships.

† Franz Baco von Verulam, *Die Realphilosophie und ihr Zeitalter*. Von Kuno Fischer. Leipzig—Brockhaus. 1856.

proved deficiencies on the higher, super-sensual side of philosophy, were first clearly recognized, and attempted to be met, by the theory of Kant, whom it places in the same relation to *mental*, as Bacon holds to *physical* science—as the first discoverer of the true mode of investigation. This book contains a very spirited, and on the whole, I think, a very just, criticism on Mr. Macaulay's well-known article on Bacon's philosophy in the *Edinburgh Review*; which I remember reading, when it first came out, with a feeling even then, that our brilliant essayist had not completely caught the true spirit of the Baconian system, and had estimated philosophy altogether from too low and utilitarian a point of view. Fischer's discourse on Spinoza I have not seen, and therefore cannot tell how far he may have wounded, in any unguarded expression, the reasonable susceptibility of the religious public. But his work on Bacon is written in a calm, earnest, dispassionate and reverential spirit; with a marked concern throughout for religion and morality, as the highest interests of humanity; and in a style so clear, compact and terse, that one cannot but wish more of his learned compatriots would have compassion on their readers by imitating it. Fischer is engaged in publishing a series of monographs on the leaders of our modern philosophy. Those on Spinoza, Leibnitz and Bacon, have already appeared. He is now occupied with a similar work on Kant.

My employments here have not left me much time to attend to Schools. Indeed, the vacation both of the Schools and of the University began not long after my arrival; but I have reason to believe, that the work of instruction is still carried on very thoroughly. This is one of the bright sides in the present condition of Germany; though a certain party in the Church, like a certain party in our own Establishment, are using immense efforts to bring the school-system more completely under ecclesiastical influence. I hope in both countries they will be thoroughly worsted. I was present at the concluding ceremony of the half-yearly examination of the higher *Bürgerschule* in the *Aula* of the University. It was a very simple affair, consisting of some recitations by the pupils in German, French and English (the last less intelligible to me than the two former), and an address by the Director, Dr. Weber. It was a great contrast—strikingly illustrative of the difference between the German and the French character—to a distribution of prizes which I witnessed last year in the College of Avranches, where a military band and a detachment of the national guard under arms gave the whole thing a very martial air, and each successful competitor went up to receive his honours from the hands of the presiding authorities and their friends, to the roll of the drum, and was crowned with a chaplet of laurel and greeted with a kiss on both cheeks.

One of the most eminent men now in Heidelberg is Bunsen, the professor of Chemistry, who attracts hearers from all parts of Europe and America. It is a proof of the increased importance now attached to the physical sciences, that the Government here recently erected for him, at considerable expense, one of the most complete laboratories in the world. Through the kindness of a young friend, one of his pupils, I enjoyed the opportunity of going over this admirable establishment with the professor himself. He is a man of remarkably simple and unassuming manners, whose whole being is absorbed by his favourite science. The laboratory, with a handsome suite of apartments for the professor's own residence, forms a building by itself at a considerable distance from the ordinary University. It contains a light and spacious theatre or lecture-room, capable of accommodating about five hundred hearers, with an opening at the back of the professor's table into a small adjoining laboratory, from which the preparations for experiments are handed to him as they are wanted during the lecture. Besides the professor's private laboratory, there is a large working laboratory for about sixty students, furnished with every requisite for making experiments. Bunsen is the idol of his pupils (I know several of them), and seems to have the happy art of inspiring them with the same enthusiasm for his science as animates himself.

Among other acquaintances which I have had the good fortune to make, is that of Mittermaier, professor of Criminal Jurisprudence, a person of great eminence in his own branch of learning, who was for many years President or Speaker of the Chamber of Deputies at Baden. Though a Catholic, he is a man of very liberal views, and warmly interested in all philanthropic matters. I found him *quite up*, as the phrase is, in most of our social questions; familiar with the names of Miss Carpenter and Matthew Hill, and well acquainted with what they have been doing for the reformation of juvenile criminals. When I last saw him, he spoke of his intention to attend a great convention of philanthropists that was to take place at Brussels some time this month. Some of his opinions would not find favour with our predominant school of political economy. With Sismondi, he believes in the preferableness, for social well-being, of small properties to large estates with tenant-farmers, and strongly recommended me to visit a district in this neighbourhood, on the other side of the Rhine, the condition of which, he said, would fully justify his view. Other occupations have prevented my doing this. Another object for which he is very enthusiastic, as a means of elevating the working classes, is the introduction of limited liability in partnership. He told me, he had studied the history of this practice, and could trace its origin to the maritime law of some of the Italian states in the middle ages. He mentioned in particular the ancient statutes of Trani, going back to the 11th

century, and those of Ancona, Florence and Genoa, in subsequent centuries. What is very remarkable, he observed that this practice, which has been advocated in modern times with a view to benefit the *lower* classes, arose in the middle ages from a desire to spare the pride of the *higher*. The nobles, disdaining to enter openly into trade, were yet desirous of reaping some of its profits, by venturing a portion of their capital, as sleeping partners, in maritime enterprize, on condition that they should share the profits, if there were any, but in case of loss should be answerable only to the amount of capital which they had embarked.

Schlosser, the well-known historian, a fine, vigorous old man of eighty, now living in most comfortable retirement, with a charming library and a beautiful garden, I have several times visited. He is a German of the old school, who not only deploras the present political and religious reaction that has come over his country, but also regrets the change that has been introduced into Heidelberg itself by the influx of strangers who have destroyed its primitive quiet and simplicity, and the diminished interest of the present generation of students in higher studies—such as have not any direct bearing on worldly advancement. He spoke on these topics with great warmth and earnestness. Since his retirement from his chair, the old man has been solacing his leisure with the study of Dante, on whose writings he has recently published a monograph. Schlosser is a thorough liberal in all his views. For German philosophy he professes no fondness, though Hegel in early life, when they were both professors in Heidelberg, had been his particular friend. His talent is plainly—and he is aware of it—historical, not speculative. He told me that, when young, he had studied the successive schools of German philosophy up to Schelling; when he gave up the task as hopeless, and threw himself for support and guidance on the natural, healthy trusts of the human mind. From Schlosser I obtained an introduction to Strauss, the author of the well-known “*Leben Jesu*,” whom I was desirous to see and converse with, as being, in some respects certainly, one of the most remarkable men of his day. He is separated from his wife, owing, I believe, to incompatibility of temper, without any imputation of immorality on either side. He removed from Würtemberg which is his native country, to Heidelberg, for the sake of educating his children. He is living, apparently on small means, in great seclusion, seeing almost nobody. He occasionally visits Schlosser and a few others. He occupies the uppermost story of a plain-looking house in the Plöckstrasse. On ringing the bell at an inner door, he put his head out of the window to see who was there, and bade me walk up. He received me courteously at the head of the stairs, when I presented professor Schlosser's note. His daughter, a little girl of about twelve years of age,

neatly dressed and of pleasing appearance, was in the small chamber when I entered, but immediately withdrew into an inner room. I was told that I should find him cold and dry in manner, and much embittered against the world, on which he had turned his back as much as it was possible to do. During our short interview (I stayed and talked with him about half an hour) I saw no indication of this, and was agreeably disappointed. His countenance is not unpleasing, though without any marked expression; his manners are simple and unaffected; and he expresses himself, if not with much warmth or apparent feeling, yet with a certain clear and quiet collectedness. I told him (which I could do with honesty) that I had often been much instructed by his insulated criticisms and by his clear statements of fact, especially in his "Dogmatik," though I dissented entirely from the fundamental principle of his religious philosophy. He said he was not surprised at that, and betrayed no alteration of manner. When, in the course of conversation, I expressed my conviction that there was an indestructible religious element in human nature, which found its most perfect expression in Christianity, he said that was his own opinion also; that he had been misunderstood; that he never intended to deny that religious element or its presence in Christianity; that his object had only been to break up and dissipate old and superseded forms, which were a different thing from the religion itself. He spoke, as everybody does, of the present ecclesiastical reaction in Germany, and of its certain effect in driving all original, earnest, thinking minds from theological study; but what, he said, he most deplored, was his belief that much of this reaction did not rest on any conviction. He told me that he had recently had a letter from Paris respecting the translation of his "Dogmatik" into French. He has himself abandoned theology as a pursuit, and taken to history in its place. He is now engaged on a biography of Ulric von Hutten, the contemporary of Luther, from which Schlosser said he expected great things. One would not, *à priori*, have thought it a subject peculiarly suited to the genius of Strauss. Schwegeler has made a similar change of study, and, abandoning theology, has recently published a volume on Roman history.

I have been desirous, during my residence here, to obtain some information about the two great religious movements outside the Established Churches,—that of the Free Congregations (*Freie Gemeinden*), which originated among the Protestants, and that of the German Catholics, which was an offset from Romanism. I became acquainted with a young man, learned and, I believe, honest and conscientious, who had had extensive intercourse with both of them. The impression, however, which he gave me was a painful one, both as respects his own state of mind, his outward relations to society, and the treatment which he had experienced. From the course he had taken, and the opinions

he had expressed, he had blighted the fair prospects of his opening life, and been deposed from one situation after another, till, when I knew him, he had lost all certain means of subsistence, and seemed to have no plans whatever about the future. Could he have found a sphere of free action for practical usefulness, where his doubts and difficulties would have met with kind and generous construction, it appeared to me that the natural piety and earnestness of his spirit would probably have restored in time the just balance of his mind. But his conscientiousness, irritated by a sense of injustice, and suspecting hollowness and insincerity everywhere, had grown into a morbid scrupulousness; certain ideas had taken exclusive possession of his faculties and infected them with a chronic malady. Under these influences, much of the substance of religious conviction had evaporated from his views, and left a vague, dreamy sentiment in its place. From his own showing, I could perceive that he had been wanting in the wise and thoughtful prudence which is indispensable to a right use of life and perfectly distinct from worldly craft and duplicity, and that he might thank himself for no small part of the misfortunes which he had incurred. I suspect he illustrated in his individual case, what is true to a large extent of the free religious communities with which at different times he had been connected. They have wanted a spirit of wisdom and conciliation; they have run into a foolish extreme of contrariety to everything already established, and have become spiritually weak through the absence of some *positive* principle of binding religious conviction. No doubt much of this may be set down to the account of natural reaction against the indirect vexations or open persecution of the Government. So injustice on one side and folly on the other unhappily beget and justify each other without intermission in this world. Uhlich, one of the most distinguished preachers in the Free Christian Congregations, has given an account of his ministerial experience, which, I think, fully confirms this view of the case, and exhibits a mournful picture of the rapid descent of a movement which originated in truly religious feeling and opened with the happiest auguries of future success—through a combination of blunders and follies on one side, with harsh treatment on the other—to a state of weakness and exhaustion which renders any important moral result impossible.* The unhappy Revolutions of 1848 and 1849 have marred the healthy development of this and other movements which were springing up in Germany, and infused into them elements of destructive violence and excess which they might else have escaped. What was at first simply religious, has become

* See Uhlich's *Zehn Jahre in Magdeburg, 1845—1855* (Ten Years in Magdeburg); also *Die Freie Gemeinde zu Nordhausen, ein Zeugniß aus ihr und über sie* (The Free Congregation in Nordhausen, a Witness from it and concerning it). By E. Baltzer. Nordhausen. 1851.

unavoidably political, or is at least suspected and treated as such. From being over-dosed with *theology* under the old system, the Free Congregations become too exclusively *anthropological*. Man is too much viewed on the side which relates to this world; the moral element absorbs the religious; and in their sentiments and usages, these seceders discover no little affinity with the Humanistic sect (*les Humanitaires*) of France, of which George Sand was at one time regarded as the prophetess. In their meetings for edification, there is a studied affectation of divergency from the forms of the older Church. They have no ministers or preachers, but only *speakers*. Social re-unions, sometimes in their places of meeting, sometimes in the open air in gardens or the country, concerts, and a discourse by the speaker on some topic of moral, social or political interest, seem to occupy very much with them the place of proper worship. They encourage and cultivate music. A four-voiced choral at the grave is the only ceremony which they use on interring a friend. They have bestowed much care on the organization of their societies, but more, it seems to me, in the spirit of political freedom than of deep religious feeling. So far as I can make out from their published documents, they have no distinct and avowed faith either in a personal God or in individual immortality. Their principles, in fact, are pantheistic.* These extremes have lost them the support and sympathy of a large portion of the higher and educated classes who were at first very favourably inclined towards them.

The German Catholics retain a distinct Christian confession, though of the simplest kind; observe the sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper; have a separate ministry, recognized and set apart by an appointed form, in which they lay stress on an University education; and in their public worship adhere more closely to the established usages of the Christian world. The importance attached by them to these points, gives to their institution a more historical, and therefore a more solid and enduring, character, and has prevented their coalition with the Free Protestant Congregations which was at one time under consideration. But the German Catholics, like the Free Congregations, have lost the social importance which they possessed ten years ago; and though both parties are recognized by the laws and have their free worship guaranteed to them, yet both are viewed with nearly equal suspicion by the Government, which will doubtless seize every opportunity, under the influence of the ascendant ecclesiastical party, to limit or revoke the privileges which it has conceded. Ten years ago, some of the most distinguished men

* This I infer from Baltzer's own words, p. 25: "Die Gottheit ist das All selbst in seinem einheitlichen, ewigen Wesen, im Unterscheide von dem Einzelwesen, das aus ihr geboren wird, und wenn sein individuelles Leben vollendet ist, in sie zurückgeht."

in Heidelberg espoused the cause of the German Catholics—old Paulus, the well-known rationalistic theologian, Gervinus, the celebrated historian, one of the seven deposed professors of Göttingen, and Welcker, brother of the eminent philologist at Bonn, himself a jurist of high character, and for many years a leading speaker on the liberal side in the Chamber of Deputies at Karlsruhe. Gervinus wrote on their behalf, and insisted on the historical significance of their movement. Paulus shewed his interest in various ways; on one occasion, presented them with a piece of plate for the celebration of the Lord's Supper; and at his death bequeathed a considerable sum for the support of their church in Heidelberg, which the State, however, would not permit them to become possessed of. Zittel, one of the pastors of Heidelberg, and now a joint conductor with Sydow, Hase and others, of the "*Protestantische Kirchenzeitung*,"—in those days a member of the Chamber at Karlsruhe, advocated their admission to the full rights of a Christian church in a noble speech, breathing the most enlarged spirit of religious liberty.* But that palmy time of promise has passed away. There is still a small church of German Catholics in Heidelberg. I attended their service one Sunday morning, and afterwards introduced myself to their pastor. The congregation consisted of about a hundred persons, exclusively, to judge from appearances, of the humbler class. They meet in a large room, belonging to an inn, which has been neatly fitted up as a chapel. At one end was a simple altar, on which was spread a large open Bible. Behind this altar, and fronting the people, the minister conducted the earlier part of the service, which consisted of singing, in which the whole congregation, accompanied by a small seraphine, heartily joined, and (in place of the prayers announced in the printed form of service) in the reading of some passages from the poets descriptive of the beauties of Nature, and expressing, it seemed to me, rather fine than devout sentiments. The minister told me afterwards that he sometimes varied the service in this way. For the sermon, the minister ascended a pulpit behind the altar. The discourse was quite extempore, and delivered with great fluency and animation. It tacitly and indirectly applied to their own case, the trials and sufferings of the apostle Paul in encountering the prejudice and hostility of the Jewish and Heathen world. With some good passages, it was on the whole, to my feeling, a little too negative and antagonistic in its tendency. Dr. Brugger, their present pastor, is a man of some learning and accomplishment, who has travelled much, and is known out of his religious connection as the originator of an association for preserving the purity of the German tongue. He was formerly a Roman Catholic priest, at one time a privat-docent in the

* *Der Deutschkatholizismus in seiner Entwicklung dargestellt in der Geschichte der Deutschkatholischen Gemeinde zu Heidelberg, &c.* In Two Vols. Heidelberg. 1852, 1854.

University of Freyburg, and gave up a good living to join the German Catholic movement. He has paid the price of conscience in poverty. His hearers can afford him but a scanty salary, which, though unmarried, he is obliged to help out by private teaching, in which he includes lessons on the piano and the violin. When I visited him at his lodgings, amidst the unmistakeable signs of very narrow circumstances, I found him cheerful, courteous and almost sprightly, full of hope for his cause in the future, and expressing his strong conviction that thousands were with him in sentiment both among the Roman Catholics and the Protestants, who would not avow it from unwillingness to share his privations and sacrifices. His conversation and writings gave me the impression of an honest and zealous, but somewhat vain, man; and I suspect there runs a vein of pantheistic mysticism through his religious opinions. The German Catholics keep up a close communication with each other in different parts of Germany, and support a weekly journal, which, among other things, gives the periodical statistics of their churches.*

In my next and last letter, I must say a few words on another institution, within the limits of the established Evangelical Church, which will suggest more points of instructive comparison with our own religious condition—I mean the *Gustav-Adolf's Verein*.

J. J. TAYLER.

P.S. I find that, in my preceding letter, the expression, “men of *Fach*,” has not been understood. It was perhaps a kind of pedantry to use it at all; but I fell into it unconsciously. “*Fach*” is the special department of learning or science to which a man devotes himself. In the German Universities, there is a very minute subdivision of intellectual labour. Men are accustomed to occupy their own limited portion of the great field of knowledge, which they cultivate with extreme, not to say exclusive, assiduity, often knowing little beyond its boundaries. The result is an almost exhaustive thoroughness in that particular department, combined, as is inevitable, in many instances, with a narrow range of mental vision beyond the special sphere, and, sometimes—what is still worse—with a feeling that it belongs of right to those who professionally cultivate it, and a jealousy of any invasion of it by one who is not a regular member of the craft. No doubt, our popularizing tendencies incur the opposite danger of vagueness and superficiality. The medium would be best, if mankind ever knew how to hit the *juste milieu*. M. Bunsen is making a vigorous effort to break down this monopoly of learning, and to introduce a principle of free trade in the great commerce of human thought, especially in the departments of religion and religious philosophy, which he is endeavouring to rescue out of the exclusive possession of the priest and the theologian, and to render more secular and human.

* Deutschkatholisches Sountags –Blatt. Published at Wiesbaden.

BRITISH AND FOREIGN SCHOOL SOCIETY.*

OUR readers are no strangers to the dispute that has for some years been waging between the Unitarians and the Borough-Road School (or rather Mr. Henry Dunn, its Secretary). The questions in debate are, whether the principles of the Institution have been violated during Mr. Dunn's Secretariat; and, if so, how to restore the administration to its original principles.

The large and influential meeting of Unitarians held at Birmingham on the 30th October of last year, passed resolutions, it may be remembered, declaring that the principles of the Institution have been violated; and that its perversion to sectarian objects is a great public wrong, which it is incumbent on the body immediately affected to repel by all lawful means that are practicable; and forming a Committee "to consider and take the best means of carrying out these resolutions."

The first fruits of the appointment of that Committee are before us in the "Historical Statement." They have been fortunate in being able to avail themselves of the ability, industry and zeal which Mr. Leyson Lewis has brought to his somewhat dreary task. His name will be recognized as that of an old Presbyterian family, now intimately connected in his person with one of our leading ministers, the Rev. James Martineau. We thought we already knew, individually speaking, quite enough to convict Mr. Dunn of faithlessness and jesuitry, and the Society which he has for many years guided of flagrant breach of trust; but the facts now brought together, "from publications recognized by the Institution itself and from the evidence of its officers," are truly the most overwhelming that can be imagined, while in these pages they stand calm, passionless and cold, and so prove more blighting and withering even than words of honest indignation or moral and religious exposition could make them. We shall imitate this virtue of the Historical Statement in our extracts and remarks. More damning proofs (there is no other word for it) were never brought forward to convict a culprit.

The Statement is divided into three periods. The first has reference to the Borough-Road School as the private undertaking of Joseph Lancaster, and shews beyond all possibility of doubt that he intended to include all professing Christians. This is not less apparent from his own announcements than from the objections of his opponents, Mrs. Trimmer, Archdeacon Daubeny and the Anti-Jacobin Reviewers. We quote a racy specimen or two of the latter kind of evidence. The Unitarian

* Historical Statement of the Principles and Practice of the Borough-Road School, compiled chiefly from Publications recognized by the Institution itself, and from the Evidence of its Officers. By Leyson Lewis.

view of the matter is justified by the most orthodox critics from the very first.

"Mrs Trimmer's work is reviewed in the *Anti-Jacobin Review*, vol. xxiii. p. 85. Quoting from the introduction to Mr. Lancaster's 'Improvements,' the Reviewer remarks:—'Such a plan may, for aught we know, make boys very good Quakers or Socinians, but it is very clear it will not suffice to make Christians of them' (p. 86). He also speaks of the plan as 'radically vicious in principle, and pregnant with the most mischievous and dangerous effects to the community.'—*Anti-Jacobin*, p. 85.

"*Edinburgh Review*, vol. ix. p. 183, also reviewing Mrs. Trimmer, remarks:—'Mr. Lancaster is, as we have before observed, a Quaker. As a Quaker, he says, I cannot teach your creeds; but I pledge myself not to teach my own. I pledge myself (and if I deceive you, desert me, and give me up) to confine myself to those points of Christianity in which all Christians agree.' To which Mrs. Trimmer replies, that, in the first place, he cannot do this; and in the next place, if he did do it, it would not be enough. . . . It appears to us not only practicable, but very easy, to confine the religious instruction of the poor, in the first years of life, to those general feelings and principles which are suitable to the Established Church and to every sect; afterwards, the discriminating tenets of each subdivision of Christians may be fixed upon this general basis.'—Hist. Statement, p. 4.

Mr. John Bowles was another early opponent of Lancaster's; and the Anti-Jacobin Reviewers, taking his Letter to Whitbread as their text, observe as follows:

"Mr. Bowles had asserted most truly in his first Letter, that the exclusion of all the *controverted* doctrines of Christianity from Mr. Joseph Lancaster's precious system of education was tantamount to the exclusion of Christianity itself; and we should have thought that there existed no man so foolish as to deny the truth of this proposition; for as it is notorious that the doctrine of Christ's Divinity, of the immaculate Conception, of the Redemption, and Atonement, have been frequent subjects of controversy; the man who could assert that Christianity could subsist without these, must be prepared to maintain that they constitute no essential part of the Christian faith. Now, though we have not met with any man so rash as to reject them all, we never yet met with one so ridiculous as to deny that they were essentials of Christianity. Let not the Socinian critics mistake us. By Christianity we mean that system of faith, those doctrines, those ordinances, and those precepts, which were delivered by Christ and his apostles, including, of course, the account which Christ gave of himself, and which his apostles gave of him. All who do not believe in these, may be whatever else they may please to call themselves, but, most certainly, are not Christians; and therefore it is that we contend that Quakers are not Christians."—P. 9.

And Southey, in his Life of Dr. Bell, whom the alarmed Church had adopted as an antidote to Lancaster, could thus burlesque the unsectarian Christian education proposed by the latter:

"It is evident that Mr. Lancaster had no more wish to make proselytes to Quakerism than to any other form of belief. According to the principle just laid down, the Romanist, the Socinian, the Unitarian, the Deist, or the Atheist, might be eligible to the office of schoolmaster under his proposed national scheme of education."—*Life of Dr. Bell*, vol. ii. p. 121.—P. 2.

The *second period* exhibits the Institution still as a private affair conducted by Lancaster, but with the aid of a Committee; during which time Bishop Marsh attacks Lancaster's plan and advocates Bell's, and the same facts are again charged and admitted with various taste on the part of the respective writers. A reply to Bishop Marsh, understood to be by James Mill, contained the following admirable passage:

"Mr. Lancaster opened his doors to all denominations of Christians equally. It is evident that this he could do upon one condition only; viz. his not teaching Christianity to the children upon a plan different from that of which their parents, or those on whom they depended, approved. There were two ways by which this obstacle to the general education of the poor could be avoided, and only two. The one was to abstain from teaching Christianity altogether; teaching reading and writing separately from it, just in the same way as painting, or music, or mathematics, are taught separately from Christianity, without any supposed injury to it. The other mode of avoiding this obstacle was, to teach so much of Christianity, and so much only, as all Christians were agreed about. This, fortunately, was the principal part, for it was the Holy Scriptures, held to be the full and sufficient rule of faith and practice by all denominations of Protestant Christians. It has, however, been asserted, even by moderate antagonists, that to teach children to read, and even to train them in habits of reading the Bible, unless adherence to a particular creed be inculcated upon them along with it, is to train them to renounce Christianity." . . .

"(P. 8.) The question, then, is, whether the non-inculcation of a creed, accompanied with total ignorance, or the non-inculcation of a creed accompanied with the talent of reading, and the knowledge of the Bible, be the most likely to lead to the renunciation of Christianity."

"In these schools the fact most assuredly is, that no advantages are given to any one creed over another."—P. 23.

A sermon by Dr. James Lindsay supplies part of the evidence belonging to this period.

"But further, we find that Dr. James Lindsay* (an eminent Unitarian minister) preached at the Unitarian meeting-house in Monkswell Street, on January 3rd, 1813, for the benefit of the Royal Lancasterian Institution established in the wards of Aldersgate, Bassishaw, Coleman Street, and Cripplegate, in the city of London, and the parish of St. Luke, Middlesex. The Duke of Kent was the patron of the Institution, the Earl of Darnley the president, and amongst the vice-presidents are the names of John Jackson, John Smith, and Samuel Whitbread. It was

* "Afterwards on the British and Foreign School Committee from 1814 to 1817.

at the request of the Committee that the sermon was both preached and published (see Dedication and Preface; it was printed by Johnson, St. Paul's Churchyard), and is entitled, 'A Sermon on the Influence of Religious Knowledge, as tending to produce a Gradual Improvement in the Social State:' London, 1813. One passage will serve to illustrate the spirit of the whole:

"It is, however, a most gratifying proof of growing liberality, that even the weight of episcopal authority and example has not prevented a very large proportion of, perhaps I might say a majority of, the most respectable members of the Establishment, clergy and laity, from patronizing, both in this and another instance, those designs of comprehensive charity, which, without distinction of church or sect, will give the Bible, and the power of reading it, to the people of England.' . . .

"Is it seemly in any man, be his profession what it may, when a scheme of instruction, by which every sect of Christians, nay, by which Jews, Mahometans and Pagans, may be rendered more useful members of society—is it seemly in any man, to divide the exertions by which this great good may be attained in the fullest extent, and at the least expense, by contending about names and forms? Surely on such an occasion as this, distinctions should be laid aside. Instead of saying, I am of Paul, and I of Apollos, the language of every liberal mind should be, we are all of Christ, and all bound alike to combine to co-operate in advancing the great purposes of his kingdom, by the extension of knowledge in connection with piety, through the great body of the people. Let us enable them universally to read the Bible. If, as their judgment ripens, they find there the substance of the Articles and Prayer-Book, though Dissenters by birth, they will become Churchmen from free inquiry and conviction. If not, it is presumed they may still be Christians. Or if Jews, or Mahometans, will they become less orderly or less valuable as members of the community, by being taught to read, and thus enabled both to think and to act with better effect?"—P. 26.

The Report for 1811 (Introduction) contains the following passage:

"ONE REGULATION IT IS NECESSARY TO STATE. In order to obviate the scruples which parents and guardians attached to any particular form of Christianity might feel with respect to the religious instruction imparted in Mr. Lancaster's schools; and in order to extend the benefits of his plan of education to all the religious denominations of the community, instead of confining them to one or a few, it is an inviolable law to teach nothing but what is the standard of belief to all Christians, *the Scriptures themselves*. The children are not only taught to read the Bible, but are trained in the habit of reading it, and *are left entirely to the explanations and commentaries which their parents or friends may think it their duty to give them at home.*"—P. 29.

And at a meeting of the friends of the Society, May 9, 1812, the following resolution passed among others of a similar character:

"On the motion of the Duke of Sussex, seconded by F. Horner, Esq., M.P.:—2nd. That by confining instruction in school to the Holy Scriptures, which are the foundation of all religious instruction, no doctrine repugnant to any class of Christians can be introduced; while the clergy

and ministers are left at full liberty to inculcate their own peculiar catechism and sentiments on the children belonging to their respective communions."—P. 30.

These are a mere sample of testimonies, "plenty as blackberries," from friends and foes to the unexclusive system.

The *third period*, beginning with 1813, presents the Institution as passing out of Joseph Lancaster's hands and becoming public property. His pecuniary embarrassments are explained; his subsequent misunderstandings with the Committee of the School Society seem still to be involved in mystery. But the principle of the Society is reiterated in the same terms as always hitherto. Rule IV. puts it into words:

"Rule IV. All schools which shall be supplied with teachers at the expense of this Institution, shall be open to the children of parents of all religious denominations; reading, writing, arithmetic and needlework, shall be taught; the lessons for reading shall consist of extracts from the Holy Scriptures; no catechisms or peculiar religious tenets shall be taught in the schools, but every child shall be enjoined to attend regularly the place of worship to which their parents belong."

"* * * The grand object of the Institution being to promote education in general, any application for the training of a teacher, at the expense of the persons thus applying, will be attended to, although such intended school is not to be conducted on the extended principles of this Institution."—P. 39.

And the Committee advertise in these terms in May, 1814:

"That the Committee having for some time past derived little assistance from the personal services of Joseph Lancaster, the public may rest assured that the Institution still remains upon precisely the same foundation as before, and that all arrangements whereby the great work of public education has been hitherto facilitated, subsist in their full vigour, and that this great national object will be prosecuted with undiminished activity by the same Patrons, Trustees and Committee, in whom the friends of education have been accustomed to confide."—P. 41.

In the Report, May 28, 1813, the Committee thus explain the *fourth* Rule, by which it is evident that *other times* than the school hours, *other places* than the school, and *other persons* than the masters, were understood to be intrusted with the doctrinal instruction of the children:

"The Institution undertakes to teach the Bible, it confines itself to the Bible; but it neither obstructs nor discourages the teaching of the Church Catechism, for every minister and every parent, or every subscriber to the schools, is at liberty in another place to teach their catechisms, and instil into the minds of the children belonging to them their peculiar religious sentiments; but if a Society should refuse to teach the Bible without the Catechism, it is apparent it would certainly obstruct the reading of the Bible. By leaving the teaching of the Catechism to other persons out of the schools, members of the Church of England can associate with a large number of persons who, from education and principle, could not be expected to concur in the teaching of a Catechism they do not approve of; at the same time it does not follow that the

Church members of the Institution are not as active and zealous in the teaching of their Catechism as their opponents; and even were they less active and zealous, it is not the fault of the Institution, for its constitution lays no restraint on teaching the Catechism.

“The Institution gives no countenance to the peculiar doctrines of any sect; it recommends the reading of the Bible, and in this it follows the direction of our Saviour:—‘Search the Scriptures, for they are they that testify of me.’ The Institution is constituted on this simple and comprehensive principle, that it may not exclude the aid of *any persons professing to be Christians.*” Also Appendix, p. 47.”

“In the Appendix they adduce also the following passage from a Charge of the Bishop of St. David’s, referring to the Bible Society, as follows:—

“(P. 51.) ‘The Society is constituted on this simple and comprehensive principle, that it may not exclude the aid of any persons professing to be Christians. Indeed, no contribution for the distribution of the Bible can be unacceptable, whether it come from a Churchman or Dissenter, from a Christian, Jew, Mahometan or Heathen. Connection with the Bible Society communicates no aversion to the Prayer-Book. It gives no countenance to the peculiar doctrines of the Presbytery, or of Socinus, or Fox, or Whitfield.’

“(P. 49.) Before which they state—

“‘That the analogy between the Bible Society and the School Society is so very close, that the arguments advanced in favour of the one are equally applicable to the defence of the other.’”—Pp. 43, 44.

The parallel between the two Societies might further be traced (with a practical difference indeed) in the history of the *Trinitarian Bible Society*, which was a secession from the original Bible Society by those who had been defeated in their attempt to do what Mr. Dunn and his coadjutors have succeeded in effecting in the School Society. In the one case, the doctrinists failed and seceded; in the other, they have gradually perverted the original trust.

The co-operation of Unitarian ministers during this period is adduced, and might doubtless have been more fully illustrated, as they and their flocks were everywhere prominent in the foundation and management of Lancasterian or British Schools. And clerical and episcopal zealots still charge its conductors with tending to Unitarianism. The latter part of the third period seems devoted to wiping off this imputation, and a most curious history is unfolded of the gently insidious steps by which this process has been effected under the Secretariat of Henry Dunn, Esq., beginning with the year 1830. Many of us know by personal experience how adroitly Mr. Dunn has changed faces between a town where the orthodoxy of the Society was to be vouched for, and one where he had to meet Unitarians as its best supporters. The by-ways of this tortuous policy are more fully tracked in the pages before us. The introduction of the *interrogative system* into the secular education of the children furnished the easy occasion of violating by degrees, and then denying the

existence of, those fundamental rules which forbid all doctrinal catechising, whether orally or by book. No doubt Lancaster's own plan of teaching a secular reading lesson (chiefly by young monitors, for cheapness' sake) was far less intelligent than is now pursued in the best British Schools. And if the scriptural instruction was to partake of the same improvement, it might have been necessary to lay down new rules in order to preserve the doctrinal neutrality which was the foundation of the whole union. But no such new rules being laid down, it was a breach of faith to use the interrogative system at all in scriptural matters. But it was an easy means of evading the pledge of neutrality. Then the "*decided piety*" of candidate teachers begins to be stipulated for; the *doctrines* of Christianity are reported as being carefully inculcated in some schools, and all *real* Christians are united in their management. Then Bishops and Lords are invited to examine the children in Christian orthodoxy, and Lord John Russell himself is blinded by the exhibition. The rest of the "Case" is more recent in all our memories; but the details are calmly recorded here.

ADDRESS AT THE OPENING OF THE SESSION (1856-57) OF MANCHESTER NEW COLLEGE, LONDON; DELIVERED AT UNIVERSITY HALL, OCT. 7th, 1856.

BY REV. JAMES MARTINEAU, PROFESSOR OF MORAL PHILOSOPHY.

GENTLEMEN,—In obedience to the wish of the College authorities, it devolves upon me to give you public greeting at the commencement of another session, and to say a few words respecting the duties in which it is about to engage us. If I rightly interpret the spirit of my task, these opening Addresses are designed at once to attune our own minds aright, by striking the true key-note of our studies here, and to invite and justify the sympathy of friends who for the moment may cease to be outside spectators of our work, and permit us to open what glimpses we can into the interior. To some of you this week begins an untried career; to all of us it offers a fresh stage: and while the space before us is yet clear and free, pledged to no folly and ready for all worth, it is the fitting hour for tracing the right path across it, and gathering up our forces to tread it firmly to the end. Not without reason have men in every age deemed it impious to float idly through the gates of new opportunity; have felt a sacredness to hang around the *beginnings* of things; and made a thoughtful pause upon the threshold of each enterprise, in order to possess themselves of its whole spirit ere they set a foot upon its ground. For it is in effect only the first steps

in any trust that are truly ours. Faithfulness and wisdom exercised at that crisis have in them a self-continuing power: but the false path is often impossible to retrace; the over-vehement speed brings the penalty of exhaustion and the shame of violated resolve; the idle start entails the idler mood, and as the race is harder, the force grows less. It is well, then, for us who here engage in a common work, to re-seek its primary inspiration before we become again entangled in its details,—to catch once more “the great Taskmaster’s eye,” and read there the full meaning of the charge committed to us. And if in our meditations we can at all bring out into view the essential idea of your life as Christian students, the whole organism of your appointed studies will receive its interpretation, and its several constituents answer for themselves to the criticisms of the external observer. I am far indeed from pretending, on behalf of the conductors and professors of this Institution, that its intellectual discipline is perfect in its shape and distribution, or invariably happy in its results. But I believe that in proportion as its critics, rising above the impatient tastes and partial standards of the hour, apprehend the permanent conditions of the Christian ministry in the world, they will find the more reason to respect its aims and plan, and (with us) to seek improvement mainly by bringing its realization nearer to its idea.

The single end for which this Institution exists, and by reference to which all its methods and spirit must be judged, is *the training of a body of men devoted to the advancement of the Christian life*. If the Christian life were not *our divine and authoritative ideal*, by which we are bound to try all human things,—or if its nature did not allow the service of any *class of special labourers*,—or if its standard of perfection were simply something *given and stationary*, to be held stiffly aloft, without any provision for movement with the moving host of men,—there would be no ground on which to rest the claims of this College. It springs from those who believe in a “Kingdom of Heaven” as the secret life and final issue of human probation,—who look upon the Church of Christ as its incipient embodiment and perpetual symbol,—who find in that Church functions of teaching and guidance which should be committed only to qualified and disciplined minds,—and who so trust the expansiveness of God’s spirit within this sacred Institute, that they will not bind themselves to any of its customary forms of dogma or of usage, but hold themselves not less free towards the types of the future than reverential towards those of the past. This last feature it is,—of an open theology,—by which we are here distinguished from other Christian schools,—a feature to which I trust we shall ever remain faithful,—without which we should represent a very limited history, instead of a very vast hope,—which, far from presenting a merely negative principle, is an expression of posi-

tive faith and confiding piety above the range of party and the atmosphere of doubt,—and which assuredly does but preserve the prospective attitude of mind induced by Divine Revelation, all the more thankful for the “elder prophets” that they set us looking for ever fresh “consolations to Israel.” In parting from the world, Christ “had yet many things to say” to his disciples, but “they could not bear them then.” Some of them, no doubt, have found their utterance in the ages that have since elapsed; but if the “Comforter” that tells them to the heart “abides with us for ever,” who shall forbid our prayer for deeper insight, or reproach us with scepticism in the present because our eye is yet open towards the future? When the founders of our institutions refuse to involve them in the contingencies of doctrinal definition, it is from no want of clear and fervent faith for their own life; it is because, in their view, God has more light than is needed for guiding *them*, and the Church of Christ is no completed thing, but a perpetual protest against evil never vanquished, and a pressure towards a Kingdom of Heaven never reached.

What, then, is that “Christian life” to the advancement of which we devote a spiritual order of men? Wherein does its essence consist, by which it is separated from other types of human thought and character, and shews us the falsehoods and dangers we are to withstand? If it is the life conformed to Christ’s, what else can it be than the entire abnegation of self out of pure surrender to a God holy, affectionate and infinite? If there be any words that can express in brief the very kernel of the heart of Christendom, they are surely these,—“*the living sacrifice*.” This thought it is that makes the crucifix sublime,—that gives its calm and sad intensity to Christian Art,—that sings in the Agnus Dei,—and fills the interval between the heroic and the saintly mind. It is not, indeed, that sacrifice of selfish desires has ever been unknown among men, and can be claimed as a novelty in the ethics of the gospel. Our spiritual nature is and ever was a theatre of conflicting impulses, where, under even the darkest conditions, the higher has often prevailed. But the difference is this,—that the Pagan self-conquest has been a *self-assertion*; the Christian, a *self-surrender*. The one has presented itself as a preference of reason to passion, of honour to meanness, of generosity to unworthy ease; the other, as a relinquishment of personal will to diviner guidance, a free passing into the living hand of God. The one has recognized nothing but human morality in the august forms of the Good and Right; the other has seen veiled within them the Holiest of all. This conscious identification of God with whatever is felt to be claiming us, this overshadowing sense of His communion with us in every higher trust and admiration, this investiture of the whole moral life with a sacramental value, is the distinctive characteristic of the Christian temper. The ideal it sets before us seeks

its realization by other means than *self-culture*; rather by passing out of the personal centre, and permitting the will to drop away in faith and prayer. The peculiar humility and reverence which tinge the minds most deeply baptized in our religion, are but the natural light of this inner trust looking upward and shining through. To keep alive this Christ-like spirit, by becoming its organs and conveying it into the world of human affairs, is the proper function of the sacred ministry.

But how is it possible to *train* men for an office like this? How bring the preparation under rule and system? Is it not rather a thing of heavenly gift than of human acquisition? If the native inspiration be not there, is it not a vain attempt even to make the *poet*? and to make the *prophet* a vainer still? And if the living call *be* there, will it not make itself effectual without our aid? or, at least, without that elaborate and protracted culture on which we here insist?

Most assuredly there are higher conditions needed for this work than the wisest educators can command. If there be not some heavenly temper in the clay, rendering it mellower than the coarser stuff of our humanity, no hand of ours can mould it into vessels worthy of the temple, with the sacred emblems sharply cut. And our first duty unquestionably is, to select and destine to the service of our churches those only in whom there is some dawn of God's prophetic spirit, some clearness and depth of conscience, some tender lights of affection, some glow of young enthusiasm, giving fair promise of the coming day. Let it be freely admitted that the presence of a student, after reasonable probation, within this College, ought to afford a presumption of some peculiar gifts; not of that knowledge only which any one may acquire, or that moral faithfulness which can be dispensed with in none; but of lively sympathy, of ready self-forgetfulness, of quick recoil from evil, and heart open to reverence and devotion. It were greatly to be desired that the destination of young men to the ministry among us were determined much less than it is by external accidents and conditions, and more by intrinsic aptitudes, irrespective of condition. Could we but draw to this office all in whom the fitting graces lie ready though unconfessed, its whole aspect and character would rapidly change; the neutral natures and inferior aptitudes would desert it of themselves; it would become a power of the first magnitude, and achieve again a work in society which there is still no other agency to perform. Shall it for ever remain the exclusive glory of Roman Catholicism, that she needs no secular bribes to bring to her altar the service of every outward and inward rank,—not of laborious mediocrity alone, but of capacity, of opulence, of genius?

When once the right selection of persons has been made, the problem is, “for the given aptitudes to find the fitting discipline.” A portion,—a most momentous portion,—of the student's prepa-

ration here must consist in his simply following out the impulses that brought him hither,—in living out his self-dedication,—and giving perpetual and healthy exercise to the holy and human affections in which he has recognized the calling Word of God. It is a dangerous thing to let any noble inspiration pine and die for want of genial air and free movement in its proper field; and most imperfect and unnatural would be a training for the Christian Ministry, in which no room was left for the practical gymnastic of benevolence and piety. If the whole soul is not sustained in equal action,—if during the years when the intellectual character sets and ripens, the spiritual roots of the character feed only on the sap of *thought*, no vigorous and hardy growth will ever be possible. To the young, as to the mature, books and life are the correctives and interpreters of each other; and the receptive understanding needs the invigorating balance of the productive conscience. For my own part, I can never look with jealousy on the Sunday-school, the Domestic Mission, the village preaching, as injurious competitors for the attention of the student of divinity; but rather regard them as friendly allies, furnishing a needful supplement to the work of the class-room and the common hall. I have no fear that the young divine who seeks, in the humility of Christian service, some foretaste of his future experience, and tests his theological progress by intercourse with the poor, the suffering or the child, will relax the nerve of study and reduce his thirst for truth. On the contrary, he will lose the fatal lassitude of weak affections, and the caprices of a morbid will; and the busy brain will often find less refreshment from passive intermission than from acts of conscience that bring the peace of God. Hence the way should be left open, as indeed it is, for a due mingling of kindly self-sacrifice and deeper spiritual experience with the studious pursuits characteristic of this place. But, after all, this higher discipline of character must ever remain an affair rather of private faithfulness than of public provision. And even without going out beyond the range of your immediate studies, you have a noble problem to attack. You have to see that the divine life within you is not overgrown and stifled by the intellectual; to keep the running waters pure and fresh under that rich growth. There is no necessary sanctity in the mere mental discipline of theology; and to expect any wiser or holier mood by simply stepping out of heathen into ecclesiastic literature, and transferring your critical eye from the page of Aristotle to that of St. Paul, would be a vain reliance. Throughout your course, the studies which engage you, be their subject sacred as it may, will stand related to you as *your secular business*; will bring the temptations inseparable from every human pursuit; and must be prevailed over and consecrated by a living spirit of earnest and aspiring devotion. Once depart from simple, truthful openness to heavenly things, and your knowledge will but

terminate in that sad spectacle,—the *connoisseur in religion*, who knows all about it except itself; who has mastered every theory respecting God, but not yielded himself to the Infinite Reality.

So great is the persuasive power of intense conviction and personal devotion, that there are those who depreciate everything else, and who especially evince an impatience of the elaborate complexity and range of our educational training for the ministry. They look at the fewness and simplicity of the great Christian truths,—which may be taught to a child in the catechism, and have been condensed by the wise into compendious creeds; and they ask why these, after due comparison with Scripture, cannot be carried straight into life and applied to the duties and beliefs of men. Or they are struck, perhaps, by the contrast between the inartificial gifts of the earliest missionaries and the vast outfit of the modern divine; and fancy that by stripping off the intellectual incumbrance, we should get the apostles back again. But the scope of mental culture proper for the sacred office in one age, cannot be determined either by the wants of another, or by the absolute and permanent contents of Christian doctrine. A far other rule must be appealed to, which yields a very different reply. Be the life of a people or a period what it may, *its religion must be equal to the whole of it*, covering and pervading and penetrating every interest of action or of thought. There is nothing in which Christian Faith is to be denied its voice; and it goes freely, as to its own, into every field that bears the footprints of humanity. It is vain for the secular and the spiritual powers of the world to negotiate a division of territory by which each shall bar out the other; no treaty, no award, can trace a boundary-line, any more than a mountain chain or trending coast can keep out the Almighty Maker of them both. The Kingdom of Heaven is in its very essence a universal theocracy; and God existing, nothing is at heart the same as if He existed not. It is a fatal thing to let any province of life constitute itself outside of the religious realm, and, under plea of being no insurgent land, excuse itself from consecration. So long as the national ideas were as simple and limited as those of the Hebrew race in the first century, so long the gospel needed more the intensity of God's spirit than its breadth; its possessor had an answer for every question, and neither slurred nor scorned any genuine want. But no sooner did it find itself in the midst of an Hellenic and a Roman civilization, than it had to deal with new problems, and penetrate to other seats of thought and consciousness in the human soul; and it expanded to the full capacity of those fresh demands, and obtained representatives who could use up the truth of Plato, and put a living fire into the ethics of Cicero. Well would it have been if no meaner interests had ever checked this adaptive genius in our religion, and made it seem unequal to the exigencies of advancing time. But there are two ways of seeking harmony

between its spirit and the general course of the human mind, and preventing either overlapping the province of the other; by taking all new knowledge in, or by shutting all new knowledge out; by keeping open the capacity of faith, or keeping closed the limits of discovery. And for ages past the ancient Church of Christendom, having unhappily consecrated its cast-iron measure of doctrine, will not allow the universe to be bigger than that can reach: and hence, religion having become fixed, advancing culture becomes "profane;" and proceeds without a blessing, rather than not proceed at all. One after another, sciences have emerged and constituted themselves, tastes and habits have acquired social power, for which the Church, called universal, has no greeting or recognition,—which its philosophy pronounces to be nescience, and its casuistry condemns as godless. In the vain attempt to maintain against enlargement the narrow frontier of an earlier time, the empire of the human mind is gone; and the Church, false to the eternal essence which it held, drops behind and becomes historical. Nor has Protestantism hitherto been much wiser; it has let the problem slip in another way. The old Christianity grasps at universality by holding its ancient confines, and resolutely denying that what lies beyond is really in the universe at all. The reformed Christianity surrenders the pretension to universality, releases the revolted provinces of knowledge from their allegiance, and proclaims them free; hoping by this prudent concession to retain the parent land unaffected by the giant growths it has disengaged. In virtue of this treaty of peace, intellectual research in every direction asserts its right to be purely secular, and to proceed as if it stood in no relation at all to faith; it studiously weeds out of its language and modes of thought every vestige of a religious idea, and assumes that reason might live upon the very same terms in a divine or an atheistic universe. Ingenuity is exhausted to invent for every truth neutral and abstract expressions which may serve equally in either way; and a sublime affectation of indifference becomes part of the established etiquette of scientific diplomacy. The understanding seems to be, "If you will not meddle with our geology (for instance), we will behave politely to your divinity." And yet the radical insincerity of this mutual neutrality is evident through so thin a veil. It is not true that the two lines of thought are separately pursued; on the contrary, the traveller on each feels an intense interest—be it of sympathy or of antipathy—in the procedure on the other; and often derives his chief impulse from the secret bearing of his doctrine on beliefs to which he never refers. Bold and logical minds are thus frequently brought into *conscious* self-variance, having their esoteric and their exoteric professions. Less complete and compact thinkers often remain at the stage of *unconscious* self-variance, and honestly but uneasily believe each doctrine in turn; with

Lyell to-day, with Moses to-morrow; Positivist at the Royal Society, and Christian at Westminster Abbey. Such persons have a kind of double consciousness, and pass through two unreconciled lives: their scientific thought proceeds upon one path, their religious conceptions move or stay upon another: they are alternately here and there; but can give no account of the intervening space between their knowledge and their faith, and can rise to no higher point from which both are seen together. Having at different periods passed through different and quite independent developments, they end with two creeds, two orders of taste and affection; and whenever the time comes for border questions to arise, they cross helplessly to and fro, with the feeble intercession of good-will, but without the common language and intelligence of effective mediation. All this want of inner harmony between faith and knowledge, be it confessed or unconfessed, is the natural result of falsely dividing off the secular and the spiritual, as if they were *different things*, instead of *different thoughts about the same thing*; and so permitting each method to run off indefinitely upon its own abstractions, till neither can find its way back, or look any whole living reality in the face. If Christian theology cannot prevent these evils, still more if it favours and promotes them, it abdicates its intellectual function of universal supervision and reconciliation of human pursuits, and descends to poor antagonisms on the very scene that should lie tranquil under its survey. Indifference and neglect towards new forms of thought and fields of research will bring a most certain retribution, fostering the growth of wild pretensions and "Arab" sciences, that follow their own rule, and remain outlaws and strangers to the realm of reverential reason. No legitimate direction of human activity, speculative or social, ought to be foreign to the sympathy of the Christian divine; and sympathy requires knowledge and insight. His own particular stock of truths may be a very simple series; but the range of their application, and the need of their modifying presence, are nothing less than universal; so that he of all men wants the largest and most generous training, and scarcely completes his qualifications till he is furnished with a key to every compartment of human life and thought.

What, indeed, is true theology? It is the *knowledge of God*. By its very definition, therefore, it must be co-extensive with the field of His manifestations, and have something to learn and report wherever His trace has been left. What more need be said to shew its encyclopedic character? For there is no region where He does not make His sign. He is Agent and Disposer in *outward Nature*; He communes with the inmost *individual Soul*; He is the Providence of *collective Humanity*, and unfolds His thought in the process of history,—both the general history of the race, and the special history of the times and people to whom and through whom He has made Himself supernaturally

known. And whoever is at a loss where and how to recognize Him in these several fields, is, just so far as his perplexity goes, *no theologian*.

In the *first*, we are called upon to find the religious interpretation of the *physical sciences*. To conceive aright the meaning of "Natural Laws;" to determine how they stand related to *His causality*; to reconcile the alleged action of "necessary forces" with the movement and lordship of His free thought; to adjudicate between the opposite doctrines of progressive development from low beginnings into improving forms of being, and of creation out of a perfect preconception into an imperfect realization;—these are but a few of the points at which, in the survey of nature, the roads divaricate, and we need a good *δαίμων* to keep us from divergence into godless wilds. It is a helpless thing for a divine to be unable to cope with such questions, or to present to the mind a picture of the outer world and its history which shall fall into place in the gallery of faith. Socrates describes, in one of Plato's happiest passages of dialogue, the shock his religious feeling experienced when he first read a treatise on animal mechanics and the organism of nature, and found everything explained on mere physical principles and without any reference to an Indwelling Mind. From that day to the present, the same experience has been repeated, and the relations continue uneasy between the natural sciences and religious faith. Socrates was led by it to relinquish physical pursuits, and resort to moral studies in hope of better light; and doubtless he went to the true source for apprehension of divine things. But, once in clear possession of his faith derived thence, he returned with it upon the subjects dark before, and transfigured them with its illumination. How much more should we, who have not our faith to seek in the first instance, resolve to conquer by it the difficulties and repugnances of natural science, and bid the interpreted sky of Newton, not less than the mysterious Hebrew heavens, declare the glory of God, and the morning stars sing together! The least we can ask from the divine is, that as material studies are perpetually troubling the conceptions of faith with a fatalistic shadow, he should be qualified to shew how little there is any real eclipse, and how completely the darkness is flung by phantasms of imagination. For this purpose he must gain entrance into the interior of the natural sciences, grow familiar with their logical processes, and discriminate between the mere fictions of method and the eternal fact of things.

In the *second* realm of divine manifestation,—the individual soul,—problems still more immediately involved in all Christian teaching urge themselves upon our attention. Need I do more than pronounce the words "Holy Spirit," to indicate the point at which our religion comes into immediate contact with psy-

chology and morals and the whole procedure of reflective self-knowledge? If there be any one characteristic of Christian revelation more assured than all the rest, it is this faith,—that the most intimate relations subsist between the human spirit and the Divine,—that neither sits solitary in respect to the other,—that they do somehow meet upon the same field of consciousness, and in their personal life continually exercise opposing or concurrent or reciprocating action. To conceive aright of this mutual attitude is a prime necessity not only for all speculative thinkers on religious doctrine, but for the hourly experience of every meditative Christian. For a man not to know himself from his God, his Tempter from his Inspirer, is to remain blind to the first conditions of his responsible existence, and close the shutters of his moral reason. It is too late to put men off with vague phrases, once perhaps sufficient for the undeveloped consciousness of believers, but now only raising questions to leave them in the dark. After ages of fermenting doctrine, you cannot go back to the unmixed elements, but must work forward to the clear and finished product. Does not the central truth on this matter encounter perpetual contradiction at both ends? On the one hand, is not all Divine action in the soul explained away into the self-action of her own laws? And, on the other, is not the free human personality flung into the sweeping tides of Pantheistic power? And shall the Church be able to speak no mediating word? To do so with any effect, her ministers must be furnished with some coherent theory of human nature, and know what they mean when they speak of the Will, the Conscience, the Reason, the Affections;—the promptings of God's spirit and the working of their own. Scarcely can they engage in a single act of prayer, without an *implicit* belief on this whole system of relations; and they cannot, if need be, defend the act as accordant with the highest reason, without rendering their belief *explicit*.

In the *third* field of divine manifestation,—the providential training of the human race,—we encounter the questions which more immediately concern us as believers in historical revelation. *Elsewhere*, we are engaged in settling the conditions and drawing out the essence of *all* religion, and securing it from being lost amid the other and lower activities of our nature. *Here*, we disentangle the essence of the *Christian* religion, by comparing its characteristics, as a divine element in human affairs, with the other means by which God has left his witness in the courses of history. On this side, we obtain a correction to the excessive individualism of Protestant piety, sequestering the private mind with God, and abandoning Society and States to the secular expedencies; and are lifted to the higher view which the Catholic theology contains but the Catholic hierarchy corrupts,—that our humanity is one vast organism, at once the object and the medium

of a Divine and holy purpose ; that the flow of peoples, the consanguinities of language, the order of colonization, the diversities of indigenous genius, the blossoming and fall of literatures, the consolidation and dissolution of polities, are but modes and pulsations of a continuous Divine Thought, passing through time and giving it greater fulness as it goes. The more reverential spirit which this conception carries into historical studies is so far from impairing, that it incalculably enhances, our spiritual trust in the gospel of Christ. Christianity, as it has come down to us, is in any case the confluence of many currents in our humanity. You cannot detach it, as an insulated divineness, from relations with the surrounding space. It did not fall as a shooting star upon our world ; it cannot hang suspended and apart in the air above us ; it was a heavenly dawn for which the gliding earth had been long preparing ; and it is appointed to shine more and more towards a perfect day. How, then, are we to regard the tributaries that from the first have passed into it from the life and thought of men,—the Hebrew types of conception, the Hellenic elements of speculative faith, the Roman grasp of objective conditions, the Teutonic depth of subjective experience ? Are we to fling these out as foreign intrusions, and treat them as *corruptions*, simply because they are *human* ? Whoever begins the process of weeding on this principle, will soon find his hand among the deepest roots, and plucking up the fairest flowers, till he scarcely knows his Eden from a fallow-field. But if God lives and acts *through* the human as well as beyond it, then may divine elements enter by that channel as well as by another ; and that which flows in from the fields of history is not on that account to be dried off again as an impurity. If between Christianity as a divine revelation and the other types of human thought and character there is not mere antagonism and mutual exclusion, but a prepared and Providential relation, as of mutual supplements in one comprehensive scheme, neither the human nor the superhuman suffers from the alliance, but both acquire a dignity auguster than before. At all events, the Church which it is given us to teach and guide as we best may, is delivered to us from the past, and has again to be delivered by us into the future, as the depository of an historical religion ; and the conditions of our trust cannot be understood and fulfilled without careful study of all its antecedents, its Divine sources and its human vicissitudes. Thus only will its true ideal become clear to us ; and we shall acquire the spiritual tact to separate whatever is heterogeneous or accidental, whether in the teachings of others or in hereditary formulas of our own. Historical theology pre-supposes, no doubt, the philosophical and moral, and in that sense is subject to their conditions. But, on the other hand, it constitutes the great field of their application, the text given for their interpretation, the living Kingdom of God, whose laws they proclaim and of which

their vaticinations are spoken; and in this sense it is the crown and completion of them all.

If these remarks seem to sweep over too wide a field, and not to assign with sufficient minuteness the proper place to the specific parts of theological discipline, it is because I am chiefly anxious to insist on the *all-comprehensive* character of Christian education. The grand function of pure religion (if I read it right) is to preserve the *wholeness* of our living relations, and penetrate them throughout with the spirit of devout faith; to watch against the encroachment of habits and thoughts out of harmony with it; to decline a mere place as one among many knowledges and tastes, and maintain itself as a spirit among all. If there is any class of Christian teachers free to assume this panoptic position, and bound by their antecedents to aim at the hearty and complete reconciliation of philosophic thought and holy faith, assuredly it is the representatives of a body which has never imposed a creed and never feared a truth. And did we but read the signs of the times with an eye of faithful insight, I believe we should look with a moment's shame at our past negligence, and devote ourselves with life-long hope and courage to do our providential part.

REV. JOHN COLSTON AND REV. G. V. SMITH.

SIR,

As I had not an opportunity of signing the Address lately presented to Mr. Smith by several members of the College Committee, and as I entertain a high opinion of his talents and of the faithful manner in which he has discharged the duties of his office, I shall feel obliged if you will give insertion to the accompanying note in the next No. of the Reformer.

JOHN COLSTON.

Wilmslow, Oct. 16, 1856.

Wilmslow, Oct. 9, 1856.

MY DEAR SIR,—On my return from Norway, I find, on looking over the Christian Reformer for the present month, that an Address was recently presented to you by several members of the Committee of Manchester New College, expressive of their deep regret at the occurrence of circumstances which have induced you to resign the office of Theological Tutor in connection with that Institution. To every sentiment contained in that Address I most cordially subscribe; and if I had been at home, I should have had great pleasure in adding my name to those of my colleagues who so entirely approve of the able, faithful and impartial manner in which for several years you have discharged the arduous duties of an office, unsought by yourself, and for which you are known, by your older brethren in the ministry, to be peculiarly qualified.

Believe me, dear Sir, with much sympathy and respect, yours very sincerely,

JOHN COLSTON.

The Rev. G. Vance Smith.

CRITICAL NOTICES.

The Sabbath-School Expository Bible. Notes, Critical, Explanatory and Practical. By John Campbell, D.D. No. I. M'Phun, Glasgow.

DR. JOHN CAMPBELL is the representative and head of the less learned and more enthusiastic portion of the Independent body. His activity is boundless. He edits the *British Banner*, a somewhat coarse and intolerant weekly journal, and a monthly periodical of not much higher mark, entitled, *The Christian Witness*. He is, in addition, the great *malleus hæreticorum* in the Independent denomination, and assails with a fierce dogmatism, of which Dissenting literature has never (at least since the day of William Huntington, the Antinomian) had a more remarkable instance, all who shew any disposition to think for themselves on theological matters, and throw off the old symbols of orthodoxy. He is now about to add to his multifarious denominational and literary offices, the task of editing for the Sunday-schools of the United Kingdom an Expository Bible. Of his fitness for this task, his previous writings do not perhaps furnish the most satisfactory proof. We have the first No., however, before us. It is a somewhat extraordinary production. There are few difficulties, doubts or scruples, in Dr. Campbell's path. According to his practice, the great duty of an expositor of the Bible is to pass by every difficulty, and to dwell only or chiefly on those passages which may be made to bear on the popular orthodoxy of the day. He troubles himself with none of the concessions which more learned men of his own and other "orthodox" denominations have made. Every text with an orthodox sound is fish that may be swept into his Sabbath-school net; and where even an orthodox *sound* is wanting, then his own unhesitating asseverations can supply the "orthodoxy" which Scripture lacks. Thus he finds in the first chapter of Genesis proofs of a Triune God. His words are, "At the outset of creation, the doctrine of a plurality of persons in the Godhead, Father, Son and Spirit, is distinctly set forth; the Father as speaking, the Son and the Spirit as working." His explanation, when he goes into detail, is, that by the Son of God matter was spoken into being. The office of the Holy Spirit, he intimates, was that of "replenishing the void and ordering confusion," by which he means, reducing confusion to order. Now Michaelis, Stuart and other learned and reputedly "orthodox" divines, have admitted and argued that the personality of the Spirit was utterly unknown to the Jews before the advent of Christ. Sunday scholars know nothing of this, and why should Dr. Campbell trouble himself about it? Advancing to Gen. iii., Dr. Campbell informs us that "fig-leaves are a meet emblem of human righteousness, and skins of the righteousness of faith"! We mark by the way one concession—"The matter of the Garden" (of Eden) "is somewhat figurative." Unitarian interpreters go a little farther, and say it is altogether figurative. In Gen. iv., our worthy expositor finds traces of Cain's being a kind of Deist and Abel a good orthodox believer. "Cain viewed the Most High simply as the God of nature; insensible to guilt, he sought no mercy; he came merely acknowledging that the earth was the Lord's and the fulness thereof. Abel was mainly concerned about grace and salvation; the great Atonement chiefly occupied his mind." In expounding the doctrine of the Deluge, Dr. Campbell warns "young

people" against a "godless geology." Our expositor is drawn into the use of this unmeaning phrase by the too seductive force of alliteration. The epithet "godless" is unmeaning, or something worse, when applied to "geology." If any department of science ministers to piety, so far as piety depends on a conviction of the existence and providence of an all-wise Creator, geology certainly does. It shews the prevalence in the entire surface of the globe of a rule; that rule wise and beneficent; and hence the geologist is led to the perception of the necessity of an intelligent Mind and a gracious Ruler as the Creator of the globe. Of the several treatises published a few years ago to prove the power, wisdom and goodness of God from the manifestation of these attributes in the creation, not one furnished proofs more clear and strong than that composed by the late Dr. Buckland, and the arguments of which were drawn from the mineral structure of the earth. He shewed by convincing arguments, resting on numerous unquestionable facts, that the inorganic elements of the mineral kingdom and the actual dispositions of the materials of the earth, afford the proof of wise and provident intention in their adaptation to the vegetable and animal kingdoms, and especially to the condition of man. He shewed also that geology is an irresistible confutation of the atheistic theories of an eternal succession or a gradual development. From the organic remains of a former world, he proved that before man was created the earth was occupied by extinct species of animals and vegetables, all exhibiting clusters of contrivances; and from these facts he demonstrated the exercise of stupendous intelligence and power. In short, geology, while it furnishes irresistible arguments to confute the Atheist and the Polytheist, supplies "a chain of connected evidence, amounting to demonstration, of the continuous being and of many of the attributes of the one living and true God."* All geologists unite in teaching these facts and deducing these conclusions. To call them or their system "godless," is to use words in direct opposition to their proper meaning. But "godless" is with Dr. Campbell like the word "Socinian," a mere nickname, ready to be thrown at any man who holds opinions different from him, or uses arguments which he finds it easier to denounce than confute. Dr. Campbell chooses to regard the Bible as the great depository and teacher of all science. This is an authority which the Bible never claims to possess. In confuting this claim, geology is antagonistical neither to the Bible nor to God. They are the promoters of "godless" theories who endeavour by their own unreasoning dogmatism, and the fears which are the offspring of ignorance, to stop the advance of that true science which leads

"Through Nature up to Nature's God."

We hoped that we had outlived fanaticism of this kind. Distasteful anywhere, it is especially so in one who puts himself forward as a teacher of teachers. A worse disservice can no man offer to the Bible in this progressive and inquisitive age, than to set it in direct antagonism to the truths demonstrated by science. On the lips of men who draw their inspiration from the Vatican, we know that the word "godless," whether applied to colleges or that which is taught therein, simply means whatever stands in the way of the supremacy of the Church of Rome. The theory of such men we believe to be wrong, but it is a

* See the Preface to Dr. Buckland's *Bridgewater Treatise*, pp. v, vi.

gigantic and impressive wrong. But the *Protestant Popery* of men like Dr. Campbell, whose practice is confuted by their theory, is simply ridiculous.

It is not necessary to shew many other *beauties* of this Expository Bible. On Melchizedek, our expositor does admit a doubt. "*A few think he was the Son of God; the great majority, however, hold that he was a pious king and a type of Christ.*" In chap. xvi., "the angel of the Lord" is expounded to be "none other than the Saviour of the Covenant." The concluding observation dropped by the expounder in this specimen number of his great work is, that "Sarah is the only woman in Scripture *whose exact age is recorded.*" What moral lesson or what spiritual type good Dr. Campbell finds in this important fact, we are not told. Following the *rational* example of her expositor, some well-advanced teacher of a girls' class may perhaps deduce the doctrine that women are not generally bound to let the world know their precise age. But, to be serious, it is lamentable to think that unlearned and fanatical Scripture exposition like this is to deluge our Sabbath-schools and the cottages of our people. Little can Dr. Campbell, and those who profess their willingness to aid in the circulation of this gross perversion of the Bible, know what thoughts are struggling in the minds of the more thoughtful and intelligent of the masses of the people. They resent nonsense like this as an insult to their intelligence; and if this is the form in which religion is to be presented to them, they will seek something better. Supposing, as is not improbable, that the early numbers of this Bible get forced into a wide circulation, and find their way into the houses of the hard-headed men of Yorkshire and Lancashire, what a weapon will Mr. Holyoake have at his command in his next tour through those counties as the apostle of Secularism! He will not find it a very difficult task to expose the inconsistencies and unreasonableness of this last expositor of the Bible. While gross misrepresentations of revealed truth are obtaining popular currency, and while not merely the masses of working men, but men of all classes, are ignorant of the very first principles of a rational theology, is it not evident that Unitarians, possessing as they do the means of reconciling scripture and reason, faith and intelligence, are bound to exert themselves to put their opinions before the public, from the pulpit and through the press, with increasing zeal? If they do not fulfil their duty in this respect, there is no visible hope for Christianity, when improved and extended education shall have diffused true intelligence among the people.

We have a remark or two to make on the advertisements and recommendations of this new Expository Bible. The publisher, one M'Phun, of Glasgow, has obtained and is making great use of patronizing letters from two of our English Bishops. One of them is the Hon. Montague

* While writing this, a letter from a friend comes to hand, which contains a passage so strikingly illustrative of our remark on the popular ignorance respecting Unitarianism, that we venture, without permission, to make this public use of it. "Mr. W— tells me that at Cheltenham (the Scientific Association meeting) he heard two gentlemen talking at dinner. 'What are the Unitarians?' said one. 'A sort of Mahometans!' replied his friend, and this seriously and in good faith. And yet the *Unitarian controversy is gone by!* On the contrary, I believe that it is yet scarcely more than *begun*. Truth does not spread and gain its victories quite so fast as some of our friends are pleased to assume, and it needs maintaining *still* when ever so victorious."

Villiers, the newly-created Bishop of Carlisle. Some of our readers may remember the strong language used by this able and eloquent, but not always discreet or consistent, divine, when denouncing the claims made in Parliament for a Royal Commission to authorize a new translation of the Scriptures. Opposing that, the Bishop of Carlisle is surely not quite consistent in granting a kind of episcopal commission to a single minister of the gospel to publish a Bible, one of the features of which is the insertion of copious marginal notes correcting the translation. The Bishop denounces the proposition to submit a revision of the translation of the Bible to the most learned and best qualified men of all sects and parties, but sees no impropriety in encouraging an individual member of one particular sect, holding extreme views of Christian doctrine, a man of doubtful scholarship, and whose pursuits have led him far away from critical and purely theological studies,—he sees no impropriety in encouraging such a man to issue what is to all intents and purposes a new translation as well as an exposition of the Bible. We still more regret to see that the other Bishop who thinks fit to give the sanction of his name to Dr. Campbell is Dr. J. P. Lee, the learned and generally liberal Diocesan of Manchester. In one respect it is gratifying to see these distinguished men breaking through the stiff reserve generally practised by the hierarchy towards Nonconformists. But it is for more reasons than one to be regretted that they have not made a more judicious selection of the object of their patronage. They might surely have found some one whom all Nonconformists would agree to honour, and one whose union of scholarship and catholicity would enable him to expound the Bible to Sunday scholars more simply, scripturally and effectually.

Encyclopædia Britannica. Eighth Edition. Vol. XI.

THIS republication and revision of the best of our Encyclopædias goes on creditably. The new articles in the volume before us are quite an average in number and value. Dr. Hetherington contributes a rather scanty and superficial account of the Greek Church. Mr. Carruthers is the author of the lives of three poets, Gray, Herrick and Hogg. There is an interesting note to the biography of the first:

“A claim has been put up for the churchyard of Granchester, about two miles from Cambridge, the great bell of St. Mary’s serving for the ‘curfew.’ But Stoke Poges is more likely to have been the spot, if any individual locality were indicated. The poet often visited the village, his aunt and mother residing there, and his aunt was interred in the churchyard of the place. Gray’s epitaph on his mother is characterized not only by the tenderness with which he always regarded her memory, but by his style and cast of thought. It runs thus: ‘Beside her friend and sister, here sleep the remains of Dorothy Gray, widow, the careful and tender mother of many children, one of whom alone had the misfortune to survive her. She died March 11, 1753, aged 72.’ She had lived to read the *Elegy*, which was perhaps an ample recompence for her maternal cares and affection. Mrs. Gray’s will commences in a similar touching strain: ‘In the name of God, amen. This is the last will and desire of Dorothy Gray to her son Thomas Gray.’ (Cunningham’s ed. of *Johnson’s Lives*.) They were all in all to each other. The father’s cruelty and neglect, their straitened circumstances, the sacrifices made by the mother to maintain her son at the university, her pride in the talents and conduct of that son, and the increasing gratitude and affection of the latter, nursed in his scholastic and cloistered solitude,—these form an affecting but noble record in the history of genius.”—P. 8.

Henry Rogers contributes a short life of Robert Hall, concluding with a just analysis of the intellectual powers of that great orator, and a fervid tribute to his moral worth, which we extract:

"It is the crowning glory of Robert Hall that all his great powers were consecrated to the noblest purposes, subordinated to objects better worth living for than intellectual power or intellectual fame. His sacred ambition was for the formation, in himself and others, of the Christian character. To moral self-culture he sought, as all ought to do, but so few really do, to consecrate every endowment of his intellect. Of the possession of high powers he could not but be conscious, and of the temptations they involved he was profoundly sensible. His life shews us that he had learned how to make them keep their place. Naturally impetuous, impatient, choleric, he sedulously watched over these infirmities in temper, and became remarkable for humility and simplicity; full of ambition, he submitted to cast down 'every proud imagination;' in his youth fiery and pugnacious, he learned in his later years to hate controversy, and exercised in an eminent degree that charity towards all good men of all parties, which made him say in one of his sermons, 'He who is good enough for Christ is good enough for me.' In his manners he was as unsophisticated as a child, and in his conduct full of generosity and benevolence. His patience and fortitude were eminently displayed in the uncomplaining endurance of those frightful sufferings which made his life a perpetual martyrdom; while his faith and humility were evinced no less in his admission that none of those pangs could have been spared. It has been well said by a writer in the *Quarterly Review*—'It is impossible to read the works of this extraordinary man without perceiving that his passions in his youth were turbulent in the extreme—that the energies of his mind were then scarcely under his own control—that years of reflection and dear-bought experience were wanting to him, above all men, in order to tame his spirit—that, like Milton's lion, he was a long time before he could struggle out of earth. 'I presume,' says he, in one of his letters, 'the Lord sees I require more hammering and hewing than almost any other stone that was ever selected for his spiritual building, and that is the secret of his dealing with me.' In a word, he exhibited the traits of the genuine Christian, his character shining with more lustrous light as he advanced in years, growing brighter and brighter to the perfect day.'"—P. 194.

Dr. Alexander has undertaken the life of Archdeacon Hare, and has in the process both pillaged and mutilated the fine tribute to the Archdeacon's character which appeared recently in the *Quarterly Review*, and was assigned to the pen of his friend, Rev. A. P. Stanley. Intellectually and morally, Dr. Alexander is incapable of grasping the finer qualities of Hare, and should leave such subjects as Channing and Hare to writers more exact in statement and more catholic in spirit. In the life of Heylin, it is correctly enough said that his works are conceived "in a spirit of the most bigoted partizanship;" but it is no longer true that they are "now known only to the antiquarians." The Puseyite spirit that pervades a large section of the Church-of-England clergy has given new currency to Heylin's writings, and they are now read and quoted by men who ought to know and acknowledge the worthlessness of his authority. The life of Heyne is a solid and instructive article by the late Sir William Hamilton. Professor Blackie's article on Homer is sufficiently lively and dashing, and is not deficient in learning. What he says of the great epic poet is perhaps true of himself: "Calvinistic readers might think him jesting sometimes." If they do not so interpret some of the words of the Professor, the bigots of Scotland will be scandalized by his panegyric on "Homer's piety." Mr. Theodore Martin

contributes a well-written life of Horace. This is his estimate of the piety of the Roman poet :

"Of religion, as we understand it, he had little. He was, however, too observant of the world around him, and too habitually accustomed to look into his own soul, not to have been profoundly impressed with the evidences of Supreme Wisdom governing the machine of the universe, and to have felt aspirations for a future in which the mysteries of the present world should find a solution. Although himself little of a practical worshiper, *parcus deorum cultor et infrequens*, he respected the sincerity of others in their belief in the old gods. But in common with the more vigorous intellects of the time, he had outgrown the effete creed of his countrymen. He could not accept the mythology about which the forms of the contemporary worship still clustered. The relation of the universe to its Maker was a mystery to him, and the agency of an active Providence, if it occasionally startled him out of the easy indifference of a vain philosophy, seems to have been by no means a permanent conviction of his mind, influencing his actions, or giving a lofty sweep to his speculations."—P. 629.

If such were the condition of the better and more cultivated minds, how pressing was the need of a new religion, and a faith that should convince the understanding and move the heart! Among the articles in this volume which a judicious reader would wish to be longer, is one by Monckton Milnes on Thomas Hood. He intimates that the lesson which Hood left behind him was, that "the sense of humour is the just balance of all the faculties of man, the best security against the pride of knowledge and the conceits of the imagination, the strongest inducement to submit with a wise and pious patience to the vicissitudes of human existence." There are two well-illustrated articles which will have attractions to two very different classes of readers; the first, on Heraldry, by Mr. King, the York herald; and the second, on Hieroglyphics, by Mr. Poole. So rapidly is our knowledge on the latter subject progressing, that there will soon be need of a supplementary article about it.

Letters on Religious Belief, addressed to those whom it may concern among the Working Classes. By S. Greg. Letters III.—VIII.

In these six additional Letters (p. 187 of our March No.) Mr. Greg completes his design. He addresses the working classes as one who has lived among them, known them and cared for them, as a friend and as a man. His well-known position and efforts for his own work-people eminently entitle him to be heard, and to be heard on the subject which masters of large establishments have very seldom either the religious-mindedness, the knowledge or the courage, to take up. Upon matters of worldly or social interest, no one so popular and acceptable as the master who shall address himself in true sympathy and high principle to his men and their families. Not, however, to the same extent will he be favourably heard on the subject of religion. It is too high; they cannot always attain to it.

In the outset he justly warns off the scoffer from the sacred theme, and seeks his listeners or readers only among the earnest and sincere, who cannot be satisfied with systems around them which appear false and hollow. He meets that universal objection to religion which men raise to themselves from the inconsistent conduct of its professors, instanced in the case portrayed in "Mary Barton," which he quotes :

"When I was a little chap," says John Barton, "they taught me to read, but then they ne'er gave me no books; only I heard say the Bible was a good book. So when I grew thoughtful and prizzled, I took to it. But you'd never believe black was black, and night was night, when you saw all about you acting as if black was white, and night was day. I would fain have gone after Bible rules, if I'd seen folks credit them; they all spoke up for it, and went and did clean contrary. In those days I would have gone about with my Bible, like a child, my finger i' th' place, and asking the meaning of this or that text, but no one told me. Then I took out two or three texts as clear as glass, and tried to do as they bid me do. But I don't know how it was: masters and men, all alike, cared no more for minding those texts, than I did for the Lord Mayor of London. So I grew to think it must be a sham put upon poor ignorant folk—women, and such like."

Vast truth in this, which the sects are beginning to acknowledge, and to meet which, such efforts as Mr. Greg's, so far as appeal is concerned, are precisely what is wanted. And he puts the case strongly and well, with knowledge, earnestness, fearlessness and affection, guarding religion itself from falseness and the supercilious treatment which the doubting poor receive at the hands of religious men. Nor, again, are the peculiar tendencies and propensities of working men themselves overlooked as it respects religious questions. But, after all, the appeal is to themselves, and never will it be in vain in the spirit of love to the brother whom we have seen, reflecting instinctively as it does the image of God whom we have not seen. And this is beautifully put in the third Letter, in which the invisible spirit of life, and the facts of life, death and suffering, are appealed to. Mr. Greg is most indubitably on the true path for us all, to find religion there, to deal with it there; to feel, to indicate, to shew it daily—in life, in death, in suffering, as did Christ entirely. And the people's being told that *this is religion* is entirely a new revelation to them; it is as though Christ should be with them again, having compassion upon them as sheep having no shepherd. Only let good men feel for them, and weep for them, and make themselves of no reputation among them, and bear with them, and heal them,—very soon in the name of such men every knee would bow, and every tongue confess once more to the glory of God the Father. That is the burden of the fourth Letter. Life, death and suffering are religion, and bring us into connection with God, and then the heart feels no indisposition to believe in his revelation.

"*A revelation!* Does not all within us cry aloud for it? Does not our whole being rise in an agony of prayer for its appearance? Is not our whole nature bursting with the consciousness that light is all around us, though we sit in darkness, and that it only needs a beam of that light to break through the cloud, at the command of Him who cast that cloud around us, and all would at once be day? Do we not feel sure that there is a voice that *could* speak to us, if our ears were only opened, so that we could listen to it, and which with a word could dissolve our doubts and disperse our gloom, and point to a brighter future, and tell us what all these wonders and mysteries portend?"—Letter IV. p. 2.

The objection to the *unseen* and *unusual* is met, and here we extract the following appeal (Letter IV. pp. 5—7):

"Wonders! Do you start at wonders? Do you refuse to believe a thing, or find it difficult to realize or admit the idea of it, because it is wonderful, because you cannot understand it, because you can perceive no reason for it, because it is altogether utterly beyond your comprehension? Close your eyes,

then, upon the universe, and fold your arms in silence, and say, 'there is nothing.' But rather—No: lift up your eyes, child of reason, and behold the visible crowd of existences around you in their true and real nature. Look around you, and see if there is anything that you *do* understand, anything that is not altogether wonderful and inexplicable. Watch the phenomena of nature, or of your own being, as they pass before you for only twenty-four hours, just while one day rises and sets upon the nations, and one night spreads its silent and thoughtful shadows over the quiet world. Did you ever ponder for instance over the phenomena of *sleep*? Night after night its gentle influence steals over you. Night after night you sink into its repose. Night after night you enter its land of forgetfulness. All your sorrows, your cares, your hopes, and fears, and busy schemings, and eager pursuits, and warm affections,—all the ferment and agitation of life, are forgotten. Life itself, in the consciousness of life, is no more. For a little while you have ceased to be, and the great drama of existence is for the hour suspended. In the mean time nature is silently seeking her renovation. The exhausted powers are gathering renewed strength,—they are preparing for renewed being. This night you are nothing, that to-morrow you may be a sentient thing. This night you are dead, that to-morrow you may rise to re-vigorated life. You are dwelling for a while in the land of oblivion and of death; and every power, sense, and faculty of your being is suspended, but just that one thread of life that shall gather up again with the returning light the mysterious chain of existence, and link the being of to-morrow with the remembered being of yesterday.

"Can you tell what is this sleep? Can you tell *why* is this sleep? Surely life is short enough without this farther abridgement. If life is of any value in possession, why so little of it, and why make that little less? Can you answer the question? Can you unravel the difficulty? And how wonderful this complete suspension of sentient existence, and then this morning's resurrection to renewed being! Is there anything more difficult of apprehension, separately considered, and apart from the familiarity which long habitude has given to our conceptions, in *death and restored life*, than in *sleep and waking*?

"And then, again, the wonder does not cease here. All men feel this imperious necessity of sleep, but each man might seek it in his own way and at his own time, and the noisy business of one mortal might disturb the quiet slumbers of his neighbour. It was desirable for the general convenience that we should work and sleep together, and it has been arranged for us among the contrivances of Providence, that this harmonious action shall take place. And it takes place not in consequence of, or according to, any law made expressly for this purpose, and limited to this purpose, but in consequence of a law of much larger and more general application, which, as it were, quite by the way, and by a side stroke, *includes* the wants of these little atoms that are swarming on the surface of this one dependent planet, in an arrangement having for its main object the conditions of existence of suns and worlds, of planets and attendant satellites, of systems and congregations of systems, of constellations and insulated orbs of brightness, whose ray of fire has never yet reached our distant dwelling-place. Hour after hour, in ceaseless and silent motion, does the vast globe we dwell upon glide round upon its axis, and turn the various portions of its surface towards the great source of light, and then, when it has lingered in that warming beam for the appointed hours, again it turns away its face towards the darkness of infinitude, and looks abroad into that eternity of silent space, which spreads everywhere above and around it. Thus light and darkness are on our right hand and on our left; and it is not they that alternately descend upon our hemisphere, but our hemisphere that passes alternately into the region of the one or of the other. Thus when you lay down your head upon your welcome pillow, and resign your senses to forgetfulness, the sleep that steals over you is part of that great system which revolves a world upon its axis, and links our insect being with the mighty suns that are rolling and flaming through the remote solitudes of the universe.

"How small! yet how great is man! An atom of the dust, yet a portion of such a universe! Does not this one thought show us at once our right place, our real nature? 'Bound to the earth, he lifts his eye to heaven.' A being infinitely insignificant, yet linked to something infinitely great! Weak! oh, *how weak!* yet surrounded on every side by power, majesty, and greatness! Grovelling in darkness, yet with his upturned eye roving hither and thither in search of light, and that light converging upon it from ten thousand points, not to unfold and illuminate all the wonders of the universe, but to show to the inquiring spirit that there is a universe, that man is not alone, that he is not cast out and forgotten, and that 'in his Father's house there are many mansions.'

"Such thoughts are *religion*. Do not start from the word. They are religion; the same religion that is written of in the Bible. Think of these things. Let them sink deep into your minds; lift your eye to look upon them, and you begin to be a religious man. Do not fear to feel so. It will do you no harm. *Think on these things.*"

In Letters V., VI., VII. and VIII., the instinctive idea of God ("He who needs an argument on this subject stands beyond the reach of an argument," Letter V. p. 3), the Bible, the character of Christ, its effect on the apostles as the irresistible proof of Christianity, the effect of Christianity on the world, and, lastly, miracles, are topics which are severally taken up and treated in a natural order and from the right side, with a direct simplicity, religiousness and animation of appeal, which to the ingenuous mind leaves nothing to desire or reply. The whole series forms a summary of appeal for religious and Christian belief springing out of a practical consciousness, actual experience and an acknowledged state of things, which, far more than a learned or technical book of Evidences, commends its reasons to the soul; and as such, though addressed to the working classes, may perhaps, *because* addressed to the working classes, come the more powerfully home to *all* classes. The style is what the most cultivated will read without a single drawback. It has the high merit of taking at once with high and low. Briefly, powerfully and engagingly, with perfect nature and simplicity, and at the same time completely, to impress the all-pervading reality of religion and the presence and power of Christianity in the world, we would engage with any audience, from the court to the cottage, simply to employ the appeals of these Letters from beginning to end. We have said enough in saying this—enough, we trust, for them to find many a reader and many an audience in families, in schools, nay, in lecture-rooms and chapels. No one, feeling and thinking religiously, can better find text-book or expression for his best desires towards others in a natural utterance and logical order. The Letters are printed separately in an 8vo form of eight or ten pages each, and together would form a compendious treatise scarcely exceeding seventy. Separately, they may be scattered with eminent advantage among our swarming populations, whose religious ties have been severed by the unreasonableness and heartlessness of dogma, or the harshness, pride and inconsistency of religious professors.

Letters on the Grounds and Objects of Religious Knowledge, addressed to a Young Man in a State of Indecision. By John R. Beard, D.D. 2 Vols. 8vo. London—Whitfield; Manchester—Johnson and Rawson. 1856.

THE author informs us in the Preface: "The central idea of this work is, that religion is congenial with the human mind, and consequently harmonizes with all its true and permanent utterances. Those utter-

ances are mere reflexes of God's voice, as put forth by his Spirit, whether in the accents of man's higher nature, the impressions of the universe, the declarations of science, the great lessons of history, the general burden of the Bible, or the truly human and truly divine life of Christ. These are each and all God's teachers, witnesses for God, representatives of God. In combination, they form God's word, God's revealed word."

The work, especially where it treats of the Grounds of Religious Knowledge, has noble aims in view, and exhibits much conclusive reasoning. Those who give it a hearing will have no difficulty in confessing that it understands what it is talking about, and talks well. It is a book of life and not of dreaminess; and, like a thing of life and intelligence, not merely skims over the surface for a chance emerald or nugget, but digs boldly into the mine and brings forth hidden riches.

The work presents three principal aspects: the realities of Religion, the nature of Biblical Inspiration and of Revealed Religion, and the office and character of Christ. Subordinate to these are the collateral evidences of Christianity, the nature of Faith and Repentance, and the grounds of man's acceptance with God.

The sources and grounds of religion are admirably set forth. With certain speculatists it is not unusual to consider moral and religious truths as far inferior in conclusiveness to any other species of truth. The assumption rests, we conceive, on no very exact idea. Moral demonstration and mathematical demonstration have each its peculiar province; but within that province the one is as infallible as the other. Thus, that Napoleon was banished to St. Helena, that fire softens wax and hardens clay, and that remorse follows the consciousness of guilt, are within the province of moral evidence; but they possess just as much certainty as that two and two make four, or that unity divided by a continually diminishing fraction approaches the infinite.

The facts of consciousness, the facts of the senses and the facts of testimony, are the chief subjects of moral reasoning, and under certain conditions are unquestionably true. Our author shews that these facts are the foundations of religion.

"The soul," he says, "God, Christ, retribution, immortality, are facts within the domain of these grand realities,—the facts of consciousness, the facts of the senses, the facts of testimony. You see, then, that religion rests on the common foundation of all knowledge. You see that religion rests on the same basis as science, ethics, art, history." "This, at least, is the position which I shall attempt to establish. In general I hope to shew you that religion is not a theory, not a fancy, not a speculation, but a reality; a reality that has the most reliable vouchers, vouchers proved and known to be reliable in all other matters, and, consequently, worthy of trust in the present issue."—I. 17, 18.

The reader must consult the work itself for the full enunciation of the realities of religion. They are briefly enumerated, Vol. I. p. 104:

"First, God, the centre and the source of all religious emotion, light, and obligation; secondly, the soul, the subject of all religious impressions; thirdly, Christ, the image of God, and the quickener of spiritual life; fourthly, retribution, or God's discipline in the intelligent world; and fifthly, immortality, as the gift of God, and the result of his training influences conducted through Christ. These are the great religious ideas; these are the great religious thoughts and affections; these are the great religious realities. Possessed of these, you have in your mind the essential elements of religion." "Here is the universal religion—here is the universal gospel."

All Christians, in virtue of receiving this universal gospel, are included in the true apostolic and catholic church. It is not because men hold a peculiar creed, and set up a particular form of ecclesiastical government, that they are members of the body of Christ; but because they acknowledge God and Christ and human accountability, and on this foundation frame the whole course of their conduct. United on these points, they keep the faith in the only possible unity, in the unity of the spirit. Neither a priest may have baptized them, nor a bishop's consecration rested on their adult age,—yet they have a higher baptism and a more heavenly consecration; it is the baptism into the mind of Christ, and a consecration of their powers to his service.

We would select as worthy of attentive study the Letters on “Biblical Inspiration in its Biblical Light,” “Miracles—what they are and what they are not,” and “Christianity beyond the Covers of the New Testament.” Under the last head is given in outline the whole history of Christ, from scattered fragments of primitive Christian literature.

“That life,” our author says, “lies before you as a connected whole, but the connected whole has had to be gathered bit by bit from many disconnected writings. In most of these writings it occurs here a little and there a little, having been quoted or employed for argument or illustration, and scarcely ever presented as formal history. The fabrication of such materials is an impossibility. Here, then, are scattered memorials of Christ, in origin perfectly reliable and in testimony complete. History such as this has every claim to credence. And this history is independent of the New Testament. The destruction of the New Testament would leave this history uninjured and entire.”

“Christianity Self-verifying” also contains much important argument. We do not see how it is possible to repel the reasoning in the following passage (Vol. II. p. 191):

“In their nature, thoughts partake of the indestructibility of mind of which they are the offspring. Homer's thoughts still live, after the lapse of three thousand years. You may doubt whether a man called Homer was their utterer, but that they had an utterer you cannot doubt. The real utterer was the real Homer. If you deny this particular Homer, you are thereby only driven to find another. He who had the power to utter those thoughts, is the true Homer. Certainly those thoughts came from some mind or other, and they picture forth the mind whence they came. A mind capable of first conceiving and then uttering them there must have been. Homeric thoughts betoken the Homeric mind. Do not Christian thoughts betoken the mind of Christ? The imperial supremacy of some mind is stamped on the thoughts of both. Carry your scepticism so far as to deny the thoughts ascribed to Christ to belong to Christ, yet you do not destroy those thoughts,—you do not disprove the existence of the mind which uttered those thoughts; and if you say the thoughts are not the thoughts of Jesus of Nazareth, you must admit that some one at least as great as are those thoughts, formed, entertained, and uttered them. Deny our Christ, you do not nor can you deny a Christ.”

There are some statements and arguments connected with the objects of religious knowledge which we must confess we have not been able satisfactorily to follow. “Christ the only Proper Sacrifice,” and “Jesus the Saviour of the World,” are Letters containing very many views with which we cordially agree, but appearing to us rather rhetorical efforts than strictly thoughtful and well-meditated expressions of religious truths. We most devoutly believe that God's spirit and power were with Christ in his agonies and trials; but surely there is a want of accuracy in the religious idea when the author says (Vol. II. p. 281), “In

every straining of the nerves, in every renewed effort, in every fresh step, God takes a part. Not to punish, but to sustain, is God there in Gethsemane, and on the way of grief, and at Golgotha." This mode of stating the fact that Christ was supernaturally sustained in his conflict, reminds us of a sermon we once heard from a French preacher, who described the Saviour on the cross, and said, "When the nails were driven, God felt the blow, and when the side was pierced, it was God who suffered." In its sober and earnest thoughts, the truly religious mind cannot believe that the Majesty of heaven and earth participates, except in a figurative sense, in the sufferings inflicted by his creatures.

There are, indeed, many epithets and expressions which sound strange, and which are, we think, contrary to a good and well-cultivated taste. On this ground we object to the phrases, Vol. II. p. 284, "the universal quest of a religion made easy;" p. 291, "the aunts and mothers of our home;" p. 301, "Jesus, the model man, the normal man;" p. 304, "bow the knee of your soul;" p. 320, "inoculation with the living energies of the Son of God;" p. 360, "mellowed the idea of God;" p. 395, "I look on a little child as a sort of moral harmonicon;" p. 36, "bell-like sounds of their simple and genuine hearts."

We have noticed a few printer's errors which rather puzzle the reader and pervert the sense. Among these are, Vol. I. p. 51, "might its testimony prevail, the issue would be at once divided;" p. 83, "who, thus knowing and recognizing God, believes that he has a minion to avenge his brother's blood;" and, p. 144, "as the breath is the token and may be called the source of life, so words are breath laden with intelligence."

We have also to notice the curious manner in which many of the shorter sentences are formed, so that the same thought is repeated in almost the same words. Thus, Vol. II. p. 363, "God's influence, indeed, is the source of all other influences. All other influences are but forms and manifestations of God's influence." P. 365, "And his grace is sufficient for us. In his grace is our sole sufficiency." And, p. 383, "Our spirits breathe in the breath of God. The breath of God breathes in our spirits."

It is, however, a thankless office to point out such deficiencies; we by no means rejoice in the employment, and we should scruple to engage in it, did we not wish that we could approve of the manner to as great a degree as we do of the matter of the work. In our own mind, we trust that many a good and noble thought has been suggested, roused or elevated by the book we have thus remarked on; and we should rejoice exceedingly if numbers beside ourselves came to the fountains which the author has opened, and there found refreshed strength.

H. G. K.

The Lesson of the Past: a Sermon preached in the Old Meeting-house, Birmingham, on Wednesday, August 27, 1856, on occasion of the Fiftieth Anniversary of the Unitarian Tract and Book Society for Warwickshire and the neighbouring Counties. By John Gordon. Published at the Request of the Society. Pp. 35. London—Whitfield.

To this noble Sermon we have already had occasion, in our reports of the opening services at Bolton and of the Jubilee meeting of the Warwickshire Tract Society, to refer; and the impression of its excellence conveyed by the reporters of those meetings is more than sustained

by a twice-repeated perusal of the discourse. The exactitude of Mr. Gordon's mind, and its calm logical strength, are well known to our readers: these qualities are in this Sermon combined with much warmth and generosity of feeling towards successive friends and advocates of religious liberty and Christian truth, expressed in language remarkable alike for its simplicity and power. We will not attempt an analysis of the Sermon, but by selecting a few passages from it justify our commendation of it as a whole.

What Christian Churches and Ministers are.

"A Christian Church is not a system of ecclesiastical polity, whether hierarchical or democratic: nor is it a social institution for merely moral ends. It is 'a habitation of God, built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone.' And a Christian minister is neither priest nor philosopher, to discharge a craft, or to uphold a school; but an 'ambassador for Christ, who beseeches men in Christ's stead to be reconciled to God.'"—P. 9.

The Bartholomean Confessors.

"There never was a nobler set of men. * * * These words of my text might stand for their epitaph: 'Thou hast borne, and hast patience, and, for my name's sake, hast laboured, and hast not fainted.'

"The ministers were continually exposed to poverty and insult and afflictions manifold. They were dragged from their homes, and cast into filthy dungeons. They were forced to hide themselves from the face of man. They were frequently destitute of the necessities of life. At best they lived in constant fear. Many of them died in prison: and lingering disease, even worse than death, was the lot of many more. Under these circumstances they prosecuted their ministerial labours as they had opportunity. They judged that it was 'better to obey God than man,' and He abundantly owned and blessed them in their work. Thus pursuing their appointed task, 'dauntless, untired,' they founded religious interests over the whole face of the country; and, while they preserved the deepest attachment to their own views of religion, they learned, amid these scenes of trial, the most enlarged lessons of liberty and charity."—Pp. 20, 21.

Unitarianism and its Advocates.

"Of those who preceded us in its profession it must be said that they have laboured, and been patient, and have not fainted. They have had much to do and much to suffer, and they have both done and suffered nobly. None have been more strenuous in the assertion of that which they set themselves to establish: or more persevering in the face of the opposition they had to withstand. Everywhere spoken against, and constantly misrepresented and maltreated, they have stood—

'Unmoved,
Unshaken, unseduced, unterrified,
Nor number nor example with them wrought
To swerve from truth.'

'They have tried them which say they are apostles, and are not, and found them liars.' That has been their special calling—to detect and expose error and pretension, and uphold the simplicity of the Gospel against the encroachments of vain philosophy and human authority.' In fulfilling this calling they have proved that 'they could not bear them which are evil.' Whatever was base or mean, impure or unfair, they have neither yielded to themselves, nor sanctioned on the part of others. A strict sense of honour has been more distinctive of their controversies than of any other controversies with which I am acquainted.

"For myself I cannot express the feeling of pride with which I contemplate the characteristics I have just depicted as marking the religious party with

whom it is my privilege to be ranked. Their clear perception; their bold determination; their love of truth; their jealousy of freedom; their endurance of persecution; their hostility to fraud; their candour and integrity—I thank God that I have taken my place in the ranks, however small may be the host, or disastrous its enterprizes, where these things constitute the normal condition of the soldiers of the cross.”—Pp. 10, 11.

Dr. Priestley.

“To the man whose name I have just mentioned we owe a weight of obligation of no ordinary kind. He was the Moses who led us out of the house of bondage into the wilderness, where, on our journey toward the promised land, we have since worshipped the one Jehovah—a chosen people to His undivided honour. Some of us may think that he was, like the former Moses, only the school-master to bring us to a coming Christ: but ‘he gathered us together as a flock,’ in the pastures where we yet abide.

“Did not the same Christian attachment that animated the St. Bartholomew martyrs animate him? His temperament might be cold, and his intellect might be critical, but it is the greater praise to him that he swerved not ever from that strong and hopeful faith in Christ and Christianity which formed his one ruling motive to the work of restoring the Gospel to its primitive purity, for which he mainly lived.”—P. 23.

With Dr. Priestley, Mr. Gordon properly names Mr. Lindsey, and characterizes them and their colleagues as “Christian men—men devoted to Christianity—in whose conduct Christian interests superseded all other considerations, and who rejoiced to give to the cause of Christ *the full benefit of a stainless honour at every conceivable risk.*” Mr. Gordon remarks in passing, that he did not trust himself to speak on this topic without refreshing his memory from the writings of that period. What the result of those pleasant studies was, he tells us. (We wish his words could reach the eye of the shallow or fanatical men who have thought themselves entitled to disparage Priestley and the labours of the Unitarians of his day!) “*My heart has been bettered, as well as my conviction strengthened, by the all-pervading spirit of deep Christian attachment which breathed upon me from every page.*”

Unitarianism and Christianity should be inseparable.

“Separate my Christianity from my Unitarianism, or my fidelity to Unitarianism from my fidelity to Christianity! God forbid! The Christianity of my Unitarianism is its highest glory. I am more and more persuaded that orthodoxy is a philosophy imported into Christianity, and kept there by every forced expedient which an unnatural condition of things demands. The whole volume of Scripture is perverted by it from its true character and purpose, and every application of learning and common sense to the Christian revelation exposes the perversion. Modern theology is on all hands exploding its unchristian pretensions, and bringing to light the Christian reality of those simple moral views of the Gospel which our Unitarianism expresses. To that Gospel those views as clearly and fully answer as they do to the investigations of science, or the progress of civilization. I am anxious, above all things, that the religion of Jesus should stand forth in its native beauty, its uncorrupted truth, its spiritual power, and its universal influence; and therefore would I, in the face of opposition, as well as in circumstances of concurrence, and by means of resistance and contention, as well as in the indulgence of charity and sympathy, uphold and extend what I consider doctrinally necessary to the vindication of its claims, or the establishment of its integrity.”—Pp. 32, 33.

INTELLIGENCE.

AMENDED MARRIAGE ACT.

On the 29th of July, this Act received the Royal Assent. It is to come into force on the 1st of January, 1857. It is entitled, 19 and 20 Vict. cap. cxix., "An Act to amend the Provisions of the Marriage and Registration Acts." The preamble recites the 6 and 7 Wm. IV. c. 85, 1 Vict. c. 22, and 3 and 4 Vict. c. 72, and declares the expediency of altering and amending them. The 1st clause provides that no notice of marriages intended to be celebrated under the provisions of the Acts recited, shall be read or published before the Guardians of the Poor-Law Union, or be transmitted by the Superintendent Registrar to the Clerk of the Guardians. The 2nd clause provides that when any party intending marriage under those Acts or this Act shall give notice to the Registrar, one of the parties shall subscribe a solemn declaration in writing that there is no impediment of kindred or alliance or other lawful hindrance to the intended marriage, and that the parties have resided within the district, if the marriage is to be celebrated without a licence, for seven days, if with a licence, for fifteen days preceding the giving the notice. If a minor, the party giving notice shall further declare in writing that the consent of the required persons is given, or that there are no such persons whose consent to the marriage is required. Without such declaration being made, no certificate or licence can be granted. Any person knowingly making a false declaration shall suffer the penalties of perjury. The 3rd clause prescribes the form of the notice of marriage, and the fee of the Superintendent Registrar (one shilling) for making an entry of it. Clause 4 provides that the Superintendent Registrar, after receiving notice of marriage without a licence, shall affix a copy thereof in some conspicuous place in his office for twenty-one days; that after the expiration of twenty-one days from the time of receiving notice, he may grant a certificate (the form of which is given in a schedule), provided the issuing of such certificate has not been legally forbidden. The fee for such certificate, one shilling; and by virtue of that certificate, the marriage may be celebrated at any time within three months. Clause 5 provides that if the parties

intend marriage by licence, the notice shall not be suspended in the office of the Superintendent Registrar. Clause 6 provides that, in case of the marriage by licence of parties residing in two different districts, it shall only be necessary to give notice to the Superintendent Registrar of the district in which one of the parties intending marriage shall reside. Such notice need only state how long the party dwelling in the district has so resided. Clause 7 provides that if one of the parties resides in Ireland, the notice of marriage without licence may be given there. Clause 8 provides that if one of the parties resides in Scotland, the certificate of proclamation of banns in that country as to the party resident there, shall be equivalent to the Superintendent Registrar's certificate. Clause 9 authorizes the Superintendent Registrar to grant a certificate of marriage by licence after the expiration of one whole day next after the day of the entry of the notice in his marriage licence-book. He may also in such case grant a licence to marry, provided the issue of the certificate has not been legally forbidden. Clause 10 prescribes the form of licence, and authorizes the Superintendent Registrar to receive for the same the sum of 30s., in addition to the cost of the stamps. Clause 11 orders that no marriage shall be solemnized in any registered building without the consent of the minister, or of one of the trustees, owners, deacons or managers; nor in any registered building of the Churches of Rome and England without the consent of the officiating minister. Clause 12 authorizes parties who desire, after having contracted marriage at the registry-office, to add the religious ceremony of the Church to which they belong, to do so; but the religious service in such case is not to be held to supersede the previous marriage contracted, and such religious celebration is not to be entered as a marriage in the parish register. Clause 13 authorizes the Superintendent Registrar, upon due notice, to grant licence for marriage in a district in which neither of the parties resides. Clause 14 authorizes the granting of certificates to persons to be married in the usual place of worship of one or both, even though it be out of the district of the Superintendent Registrar

to whom the notice has been given, provided the distance does not exceed two miles beyond the limits of the district in which the notice has been given. Clauses 15 and 16 authorize the Superintendent Registrar to appoint Registrars of marriages, and such Registrars may, under certain conditions, appoint Deputy Registrars. Clause 17 makes marriages under this Act valid, without adducing proof of the observance of all the requirements of the Act. By the 18th clause, persons making a false declaration or giving false notices, are liable to the penalties of perjury. By the 19th clause, in case of a fraudulent marriage under this Act, the guilty party will forfeit all property accruing from the marriage, and the Attorney-General may sue him for the forfeiture. Clause 20 maintains the force of existing Acts, except where at variance with this Act. Clauses 21 and 22 relate to the marriages of Quakers and Jews. Clause 23 declares that marriages solemnized under this Act are good and cognizable. Clause 24 recites the Act of 15 and 16 Vict. c. 36, and states that the number of places registered for public worship of Dissenters is 54,804, and authorizes the Registrar-General to allow searches to be made and give extracts from the returns of certified places of worship, on payment of certain specified fees. Except in respect to clauses 7 and 8, this Act is not to apply to Ireland or Scotland; and by clause 26, it is to come into operation on the 1st day of January, 1857.

It will be seen that this Act is a great improvement on preceding legislation for Dissenters' marriages. The obnoxious reading of notices before the Poor-Law Guardians (the offspring of the Bishop of Exeter's good-will to Dissenters) is done away; the time required to intervene between the notice and the marriage, where a licence is obtained, is considerably shortened; and the power of using a Dissenting chapel for marriage without or against the consent of the minister or trustees is (if it ever legally existed) revoked. On this subject, a letter has been issued by order of the Registrar-General, which, after stating the passing of the amended Act, and drawing special attention to the 11th clause of it, proceeds thus:

"Hitherto, and until the passing of this Statute, the right of the public in the above respect has by the Registrar-General, acting on high legal authority, been

held to be absolute and unqualified; that is to say, when both or either of the parties about to intermarry resided in a Superintendent Registrar's district containing within it a registered building, it has hitherto been considered that on their fully conforming to the requisitions of the Act of 6 and 7 William IV. chapter 85, 'for Marriages in England,' passed in the year 1836, the law entitled them to have the ceremony performed in the registered building named in the marriage notice, on the principle that the last-mentioned Act being of a *public* nature, and applicable to the whole community, the public in general, upon complying with its provisions, were entitled to avail themselves of the benefit of it; and this view of the case was warranted by the express language of the 20th section of that Act, which, without any apparent qualification, authorized the parties to have their marriage solemnized 'in the registered building stated in the notice and certificate,' 'according to such form and ceremony as they' [the parties] 'may see fit to adopt,' not making even the *presence* of a minister of religion, much less the performance of a religious service by him, at all essential to the validity of the contract.

"Opinions, it is true, have been divided upon the question as to whether persons could thus claim an absolute right to marry in a registered place of worship of their own selection, against the wish or without the consent of the minister or trustees of the building: the point has never been judicially decided, but the better opinion certainly seems to have been, that when once a building had been registered under the provisions of the above Act, it must, *for the purposes of marriage*, be deemed to have been dedicated to the public use; and, except in a few isolated cases, this assumed right on the part of the public, if not formally admitted, has at least been tacitly acquiesced in up to the present time by the ministers and trustees generally of registered places of worship throughout the kingdom.

"This moot question, however, is now entirely set at rest: after the 1st of January, 1857 (when the new Act will come into operation), no marriage can lawfully take place in a registered building without the *previous consent* of the minister, or of one of the trustees, owners, deacons or managers thereof, having been obtained. What the practical effect of this restrictive enactment will be as regards the public, the Registrar-General will not venture to predict: he can only hope that it may not unduly interfere with the free

operation of the original measure, under the provisions of which the annual number of marriages solemnized in registered buildings in England since the year 1836 has progressively increased. The following table shews the number of persons married in registered Dissenting places of worship in each of the ten years ending 31st of December, 1854:

1845.....	14,362
1846.....	15,338
1847.....	14,966
1848.....	16,120
1849.....	17,324
1850.....	19,252
1851.....	19,080
1852.....	20,034
1853.....	20,298
1854.....	19,746

Total in 10 years ..176,520

The Registrar-General proposes to issue official instructions respecting this new Act, and in order that he may inform each Superintendent Registrar under what regulations marriages may be held in each registered chapel, he has issued a set of questions to the minister of each chapel. We append the questions, and add the answers which a minister of our denomination of considerable experience, after consulting with friends both of the legal and ministerial profession, has sent in to the Registrar-General.

1. Will the above-mentioned registered building be accessible and free to all persons indiscriminately who shall have obtained from the Superintendent Registrar of the district the requisite authority for the solemnization of their marriage therein? or

2. Will the use of such building be accorded only to a *particular class of persons*, and if so, what class or description of persons will be allowed the privilege of marrying therein?

1 and 2. *The Old chapel has been hitherto open for the performance of marriages to all persons who comply with the requirements of the law, and will continue to be so, subject to the conditions stated.*

3. Will it be made a condition of marriage in such registered building that the same shall be solemnized by the minister of the place, or (with his consent) by some other minister as his substitute?

3. *It will be made a condition that a religious service shall be used, and that that religious service shall be conducted by the minister of the chapel, or by some minister of religion approved by him, or, in*

the absence of the minister of the chapel, approved by the chapel-warden.

4. If the parties should not be desirous of having a religious service, will they be allowed to marry in the building in the absence of a minister?

4. *On no account will a marriage without a religious service be allowed in the chapel.*

5. Will the payment of any, and, if so, of what, fee be in future demanded by or on behalf of the minister of the chapel on the solemnization of a marriage therein, either by licence or without licence; or will the payment of a fee be left optional with the parties, as hitherto?

5. *No fee has been hitherto demanded on behalf of the minister, and, so far as the present minister is concerned, none will be hereafter demanded. This answer must not, however, be taken to prejudice the right and interest of future ministers of the Old chapel.*

6. Will any, and, if so, what, fee be demanded for the use of the chapel on the same occasion?

6. *No fee is at present demanded for the use of the chapel, but the trustees reserve to themselves the power of demanding a fee if they see reason for it. But in that case public notice to that effect will be given.*

7. Will you favour the Registrar-General with the names and addresses of the several trustees, owners, deacons or managers of the above-named registered building, in order that persons proposing to marry therein may know to whom to apply for the requisite consent? If so, be pleased to write those particulars in the space allotted for that purpose on the other side of this paper.

7. *I have given the name of the chapel-warden.*

8. Is it, in your opinion, desirable or expedient that ministers of registered places of worship should be appointed to act as Registrars of the marriages solemnized therein?

9. Have you, personally, any wish to act in that capacity?

8 and 9. *I think it is highly inexpedient, having due regard to the interests and reputation of Dissenting ministers themselves and to the public good, that the office of Registrar of Marriages should be held by the minister of the place registered. Legal difficulties sometimes arise, for the solution of which the ministers of religion are not prepared. The relations, too, in which ministers sometimes stand to the persons seeking to contract marriage, interfere with a dispassionate consideration of difficulties arising from irregularities of*

documents, &c. For these and other reasons, I should decline to act as Registrar of Marriages, and I should regret the appointment elsewhere of Dissenting ministers to the office.

SOUTHERN UNITARIAN SOCIETY.

The fifty-fifth annual meeting of the Southern Unitarian Society was held at Newbury, Oct. 1st. On the previous evening there was a religious service, in which the Rev. E. Kell conducted the devotional part, and the Rev. Samuel Martin delivered an animating and impressive discourse from Luke xii. 32, on "Numbers no test of Truth." The object of the preacher was to shew that in our Saviour's time his faithful disciples formed but a "little flock," and that in every age of the world since then it had been the same, the advocates of error being very numerous, while the friends of truth had been comparatively few; that instead of this fact being a ground for discouragement, it ought to be a motive to exertion; and that no efforts made by the disciples of the Saviour for the extension of his cause should lose their reward, inasmuch as they possessed the blessed assurance that it is "their Father's good pleasure to give them the kingdom."

On Wednesday morning, the Rev. H. Hawkes introduced the service, and the Rev. S. Martin preached an awakening sermon on "Individual Responsibility," from 1 Cor. iv. 2. The preacher dwelt on the numerous talents intrusted to our charge as God's stewards, and the fidelity required from us in that character, arising in particular from the consideration that we must shortly render up our great account, and be rewarded or condemned accordingly. The subject was brought to bear on our position and duties as Unitarian Christians, especially at the present time, in which truth is assailed by a fatal scepticism on the one hand, and a no less fatal superstition on the other. In conclusion, the preacher earnestly exhorted his hearers to greater activity in the work of truth and righteousness, adjuring them, as they valued their present and eternal interests, to remember their high responsibility, and individually to act as those "to whom much was given, and from whom much would be required."

After service, the Rev. F. R. Young presided at the business meeting, and the Rev. E. Kell read the annual report,

which was adopted on the motion of Mr. Stone, seconded by Mr. Stillman. Besides the usual routine resolutions, it was moved by the Rev. H. Hawkes, seconded by Mr. Stillman, "That this meeting deeply regrets the failure of the recent measure brought forward in Parliament for the admission of Jews as Representatives, and begs very earnestly to request the Committee, as soon as they shall have deemed the fitting time to have arrived, to petition, in the name of this Society, both Houses of Parliament in behalf of Jews resident in Great Britain being entitled to equal civil rights and privileges with the rest of British subjects."

It was moved by the Rev. S. Martin, seconded by the Rev. E. Kell, "That this meeting desires to express its sense of the importance of the Revision, by public authority, of King James's Version of the Holy Scriptures, and its cordial thanks to James Heywood, Esq., M.P., for the able and judicious manner in which he introduced his motion for a revision of the Bible to the House of Commons."

In the evening, the members and friends of the Society took tea in the chapel; at the conclusion of which a public meeting was held, the Rev. E. Kell in the chair. After a prayer by the Rev. F. R. Young, the Chairman proposed, "Prosperity to the Southern Unitarian Society," and spoke of the benefit it had conferred on the district, and its claims to continued and increased support. He particularly referred to the interest it had early taken in the publication of the "Improved Version," towards which it had liberally contributed, and to the advantages that would accrue from the resolution of the British and Foreign Unitarian Association now to avail itself of the "Improved Version Fund" for publishing a revised edition of the Old Testament. He adverted to the resolution of the morning, expressive of the need of a revision of the Holy Scriptures by public authority, and hoped that Unitarian congregations would support by petitions Mr. Heywood's motion for this object in the House of Commons.

The Chairman then proposed, "Thanks to the Rev. Samuel Martin for his valuable services, and our best wishes for the Trowbridge congregation in their efforts to rebuild their House of Prayer;" which was responded to by that gentleman, with a narrative of the circumstances which had led to the necessity of erecting a new chapel, and

of the success he had met with in obtaining subscriptions, and of the prospect of opening it free of debt.

The Rev. H. Hawkes responded to the sentiment, "The Gospel spirit and practice; may it be *our* spirit and practice!"

The Rev. F. R. Young responded to the sentiment, "Unitarian views of Christianity: may they be maintained in a spirit of truthfulness and love!"

The Rev. S. Martin proposed, "Prosperity to the congregation at Newbury, with thanks to them for their hospitality;" which was acknowledged for the congregation by Mr. Young. Several hymns were sung during the evening, and this pleasant and useful social meeting was closed with a prayer from the Rev. S. Martin.

E. KELL.

UNITARIANS AND THE NATIONAL REFORMATORY UNION.

It seems that certain persons who hold orthodoxy to be better than the reformation of criminals, have been scandalized at the broad basis on which the Reformatory Union has been placed, and, misrepresenting its proceedings, have alleged that religion is ignored, and that it is vain to expect the blessing of God upon its efforts. Mr. Girdlestone, Canon of Bristol, in a letter (the spirit of which we heartily commend) addressed to the *Daily News*, vindicated the principles of the Union, but committed the strange blunder of supposing that the effect of a rule recognizing the use of "Holy Scripture" in the training of the young criminals, would be to exclude the co-operation of Unitarians as well as Roman Catholics. This error was well corrected by our friend Mr. James in the letter that follows, addressed to the *Bristol Gazette*:

Sir,—There is a part of the excellent letter of Canon Girdlestone, in the last *Gazette*, which is calculated to give an erroneous impression of the views and feelings of the religious body with which I am connected, on a most important subject. In his admirable defence of the catholic spirit in which the National Reformatory Union was established, and of the broad basis on which it is founded, he observes, that "the real difference between this society and the Reformatory Refuge Union, is, that the one does not consider it necessary to add to its rules a clause containing the words 'Holy Scripture,' and that the other does, though by doing so, as has been confessed to me

by one of its members, it will, in all probability, exclude from its committee both Roman Catholics and Unitarians."

Now, Sir, I have a tolerably extensive acquaintance with the Unitarians of the United Kingdom, and from what I know of their sentiments, I am enabled to state with confidence, that, as far as *they* are concerned, the introduction of the Scriptures, instead of being an *obstacle*, is always a strong inducement, to their cordial co-operation with any who are disposed to work with them for the instruction of the ignorant and the reformation of the guilty. In their own schools the Scriptures are regularly read. They regard the Bible as the record of God's revelations to mankind, and especially of the truths and promises of the Gospel. And whatever, in relation to Christian doctrine and duty, appears to them to be taught by Jesus and his inspired apostles, they receive as of divine authority, and desire to make the rule of their faith and the guide of their conduct.

It is possible, however, that Canon Girdlestone has been led to think that Unitarians have a version of the Scriptures of *their own*, and that they object to the use of *any other*. But this is a very mistaken, though, I believe, a common notion. Nearly half a century ago, there was, undoubtedly, a version of the New Testament, upon the basis of Archbishop Newcome's translation, published under the direction of a society of Unitarians in London. But it has never met with much favour amongst us, nor has it, in a single instance, that I am aware of, displaced the authorized version, in our pulpits, schools and families. To the great value, beauty and general fidelity, of the English Bible, learned Unitarians have always borne willing testimony. For myself, I rejoice to remember that the veneration in which it is alike held by Churchmen and Dissenters, and its constant employment in public and private, have made it a bond of union between the Protestants of this country, amidst all their diversities. Unitarians assuredly have no desire rashly to injure or disturb the "associations of reverence and affection" which have gathered around the received version. But they are persuaded that it may, in some respects, be brought nearer to the original by careful revision. And they believe it to be the solemn duty of those who have the power, to enable the people, as far as possible, to obtain a knowledge of the Scriptures as they came from the sacred writers.

I will only add my sincere hope, that a movement so peculiarly in harmony with the mission of Him who came to seek and to save the lost, as that of the National Reformatory Union, may not be hindered by theological strife, but that good and earnest men and women of every communion, and those also who keep aloof from all sects, may hasten to give the Union the sympathy and support which it so well deserves.

Yours obediently,

WILLIAM JAMES.

Bristol, Sept. 9, 1856.

AUSTRALIA.

[Extracts from a private letter from the Rev. J. C. Woods, dated Adelaide, June 30th, 1856.]

* * * The heat in summer here is very great, but, except in our indescribable dust-storms, more relaxing than disagreeable. The thunder-storms, too, are very terrific, though not very frequent, and less damage is done by lightning in Australia than in England. The general trade of South Australia has been for some time in a depressed state, owing, I think, to the fact that when any business is paying well, too many people flock into it, and thus overstock the market and nearly ruin one another. Our local government has resolved to lay out less money in bringing immigrants to the colony, and spending more on internal improvements. It is a well-authenticated fact that a bullock was smothered in the mud in the streets of Adelaide not many years ago; and the condition of the roads now, in this the rainy season, you could scarcely imagine. Still, this is an admirable place for persons to come to who *cannot get on at home*; but I wish that I could say a word to all who have thoughts about coming hither, to intimate to them to stand by facts, and to repress "imagination's airy wing." Men and women can get on better here than in England, by working *quite as hard as at home*, in a climate in which it is much more difficult to exert oneself either mentally or bodily. Nor should working people be deceived by the scales of wages; for one shilling in England would go as far as two shillings in this country; and this is a cheaper place than either Melbourne or Sydney. I may add, that young children of European descent are very sickly here; that more than one-half, I should think, who are born here die early; and that others in ge-

neral want the ruddy, healthy looks of English children. I think it a duty to make these statements to you, as, living in the midst of a great manufacturing community, you may be often consulted about the advisability of emigrating to these colonies, and I think it right that both sides of the picture should be seen. Many young women come out in emigrant ships, collected from the Irish workhouses or such places, who expect to become ladies, or to be solicited in marriage by gentlemen rolling in nuggets, as soon as they arrive. Grievous is their disappointment and loud are their complaints; not because they are not far better off here than they were at home, but because they have just to be servants and nothing more. Nice *ladies* some of them would make! I may mention, however, that they get excellent wages, and generally do well in *the long run*. A labourer gets 7s. 6d. a-day without board, and an ordinary female servant 8s. a-week with board, in this district; and I believe wages are higher at Melbourne. In short, all people who do not come hither with false expectations may do well; but it is so much the fashion for those who have written home about the place, to praise it or abuse it too much, that I feel it a duty to state to you the truth, and nothing but the truth—as exactly as I can at least.

I now turn to my congregational affairs. You will be pleased to hear that the attendance at our services, twice a day, continues to be admirable, and that that in the evening has continued to increase, so that on several occasions we have had difficulty to accommodate all who came with seats. I am pleased to add that our number of subscribers has also gradually grown greater, and that our congregation is now equal in size, respectability and position in society, to an average of the best thirty congregations in England. I read Mr. Caird's Sermon to a very large audience a short time ago, having in my possession the only copy of it at that time in the colony. The congregation has resolved to decline, for building purposes, the piece of ground generously offered by a gentleman of Halifax for the chapel. I may add, that a gentleman here presented us with a much more eligible site, which has also been gratefully declined, as not suitable; and that a position in the best street in the city has been purchased at the cost of £600, on which a chapel, &c. will be built as soon as

possible. You will be pleased to see by the paper I send you that his Excellency the Governor has authorized me to grant licences for marriages in this district. You will also be glad to learn that my Sermons on Education, a copy of which I send you, have had a rapid sale, the Protestant Bishop having gone in person to buy one. I have thus told you all I can think of about myself. I repeat, what I believe I have said before, that any books or tracts sent to me will be very acceptable, and that I can make a good use of them.

WESTGATE CHAPEL, WAKEFIELD.

The anniversary of the Westgate Unitarian chapel and Sunday-schools was held at the beginning of the week. On Sunday, two sermons were preached in the chapel by the Rev. Franklin Baker, A.M., of Bolton—in the morning, from the text, "Thy pound hath gained ten pounds;" and in the evening, from the words, "Lord, what is man, that thou art mindful of him?" Collections were made after the services on behalf of the Sunday-schools connected with the place.

On Monday evening, the anniversary social meeting was held in the school-rooms, Back Lane. A numerous company, consisting of members of the congregation, children of the schools and their friends, took tea together, and the evening was very pleasantly spent in social converse, enlivened at intervals with excellent glee-singing by the choir, under the direction of J. M. Stansfeld, Esq. The spacious rooms were adorned and furnished with pictures, portraits, illustrated books, cases of stuffed birds and other natural curiosities, microscopes, stereoscopes, &c., kindly lent by D. Gaskell, Esq., H. Briggs, Esq., W. T. Marriott, Esq., E. Shepherd, Esq., Mr. James Park, Dr. Holdsworth, and other friends. This mode of spending the evening was adopted, as the Rev. E. Higginson, the respected minister, explained in the course of the evening, as being more likely to promote social feeling and mutual acquaintance than the usual plan of sitting to listen to set speeches; and certainly the experiment seemed to succeed admirably, for there were apparently few, if any, present that did not thoroughly enjoy themselves. At intervals the proceedings were varied by familiar and pleasing addresses.

Rev. E. HIGGINSON observed, that

this being the anniversary both of the schools and the congregation, it might be desirable that he should say a few words about them. As regarded the congregation there was little to say: he only wished he could report that it had doubled, but it remained in pretty much the same state. The schools were well attended, but there was always a great want of teachers; their ranks were continually thinned by removal and otherwise, and the vacancies were not easily filled up. Adverting to their principles as Unitarians, he declared that he was more and more convinced that those principles were making progress in the minds of the community, and that, although circumstances prevented many from declaring their adherence to them, those views had been very extensively influential. He might refer to some particular indications at the present moment of the advance of Unitarian principles and freedom of opinion. Mr. Macnaught, a clergyman in Liverpool, had been ejected from a Clerical Society for holding opinions which were essentially Unitarian, and why the Bishop did not interfere he did not know. On the other hand, Archdeacon Denison was running the risk of deprivation by trying to get more out of the Articles than was deemed in accordance with Church principles; and the *Guardian*, the Church-of-England newspaper, lamented both these cases as indicative of a tendency to cast aside creeds and articles of faith, and to exalt "the pride of intellect"—a very old phrase, by the bye. Then amongst the Independent body a large party had arisen some years ago to controvert the orthodox doctrine of eternal torments; and Dr. Hamilton, of Leeds, while he laboured to oppose this heresy, was himself led into softening down the doctrine a good deal. A book of devotional poetry had recently been published by Mr. Lynch, an Independent minister, and had given rise to much controversy. Without, perhaps, possessing great poetical merit, it was remarkable as containing nothing incompatible with Unitarianism—as not enunciating one single orthodox doctrine, though in the very act of devout worship. Many eminent Independent ministers had given in their adherence to Mr. Lynch, and the cleverest organ of that religious body, the *Nonconformist*, supported him, and was accordingly pounced upon by the *British Banner* with the charge of upholding a "negative theology"—just as the supporters

of the *Nonconformist* had often spoken of Unitarianism as "negative theology," and as Romanists had applied the same terms to Protestantism. Protestantism was "negative" of Pope and Cardinals and the mass and a multitude of ceremonies, but it was positive in its manly individuality of religious faith; Dissent was negative of State policy, and Independency negative of episcopal gradations; so Unitarianism, while in its freedom from orthodoxy it might be styled "negative," was positive in its adherence to that true and glorious religion of the heart and life, that religion of the Bible, which orthodoxy distorted and perverted. He had said that there was not much to be reported in regard to the congregation, but he must not and could not forget one very pleasing addition to their congregational services, namely, the acquisition by the choir of a first-rate soprano voice, which had long been so greatly needed. Feeling, as he did, that music was an important constituent of social worship, he rejoiced at this, and he hoped that some use would be made of the improvement by the introduction of chanting, which he thought a much better means for the joint expression of congregational devotion than any yet used by them. One great difficulty which they felt was how to keep the elder school-children from leaving them as soon as their school-days were over. In his visit to Mr. Baker's place at Bolton on Sunday, he had been pleased with the sight of a very large congregation, meeting in a handsome and convenient Gothic edifice. He believed they had some kind of Benefit Club in connection with the Sunday-school at Bolton. He hoped the friends present would testify their thanks to Mr. Baker for his services on Sunday by clapping their hands, and they would then be very glad to hear him on that subject or any other on which he might like to address them.

The Rev. F. BAKER expressed the great pleasure he felt in joining in so delightful a meeting as the present, which was wholly unlike anything he had seen during his thirty-three years' ministry. He thought that, while they had not so much of the *cant* of religion, a social meeting like the present was eminently calculated to promote true religious feeling. With regard to their principles as Unitarians, he thought they must not expect at present to receive large accessions from other congregations. Theology did not now

receive so much attention as education in all its branches, and this they were ever ready to promote. They must expect to make greater advances through their social and political than directly by their religious principles. Unitarians were the true friends of the people, and were ever foremost in the support of all that tended to their benefit. He had certainly at Bolton what might be called a large congregation, and it comprised a great proportion of intelligent mechanics, attorneys' clerks, &c.,—members, most of them, of Mechanics' Institutions. With some exceptions, he disapproved of begging from other people for the expenses of erecting new places of worship; they had erected their new chapel entirely out of their own resources, and there remained but a small debt, which he believed would soon be cleared off. They had, as Mr. Higginson had observed, a Sick Club in connection with their Sunday-school and with the congregation. They had also a Clothing Club in the school, and various Reading Clubs and Music Classes amongst the congregation. He had found it to be very frequently the case that young people became disconnected with the congregation on their marriage, and he hoped by these methods to keep virtuous young people together, so that attachments might be formed and marriages take place amongst the congregation, and their union be cemented. He recommended these matters to the consideration of his Wakefield friends. Although he had said that large accessions must not at present be expected from other communities, he yet believed that their principles would continue to spread; and he could not help thinking, as he stood that day in the room where Priestley was born, that as great advances in freedom of opinion had taken place since *his* time, so a generation, or a century, would see still greater improvements.

At a subsequent period of the evening, Mr. J. C. GREEN read a telling address on matters connected with the school and congregation. He first referred to the scarcity of teachers in the school, and urged those who heard him to come forward and swell the ranks. He next addressed himself to the parents of the scholars, and upbraided them for the little interest they shewed in the school or the chapel services, charging them to attend service on Sundays more regularly, and also to come to the address which was deli-

vered at the school once a month on Sunday afternoon. He was glad to see so large a company present, and hoped there would be a corresponding increase in the congregation.

The Rev. P. CANNON expressed his concurrence with the excellent remarks of Mr. Green, and with those of the previous speakers. He then feelingly referred to the loss they had sustained in the death of their old and valued friend, the Rev. Thomas Johnstone. He (Mr. Cannon) was now relieved from the pleasing duty which had usually devolved upon him on these occasions of reading an address, overflowing with Christian affection, from their late friend; but he believed they would never forget his kindness of disposition, his warm sympathy with them, and the interest he took in everything affecting the Westgate congregation. Few of them remembered him as a minister, but all knew him as a friend, and those who knew his history could not but look with interest at the time when he stood forth manfully in the expression of his opinions at a time when it was dangerous to do so: he did indeed narrowly escape being brought under the strong arm of the law, but he had happily lived to see perfect liberty accorded both to the tongue and to the press in our land. Their excellent and gifted minister had well alluded to the present indications of the advance of Unitarian opinions; they were convinced that these were the right opinions, and they did not doubt that they would continue to spread till they obtained a hold in all hearts.

Mr. HIGGINSON said that, as their minister, he might perhaps be allowed to add his hearty thanks to Mr. Green for his excellent remarks, and especially for those which were addressed to the parents of the scholars. He had been surprised and grieved some time ago, in visiting all the parents, to find how large a proportion attended no place of worship regularly.

At the close of the meeting, H. BRIGGS, Esq., proposed a vote of thanks to the choir, and to the ladies who had provided and presided at the tea.

The Rev. J. K. MONTGOMERY, of Huddersfield, seconded the vote, including in it those friends who had so kindly lent objects of interest for the entertainment of the company.

The vote was carried with loud applause.

The Evening Hymn was then sung, and the benediction having been pro-

nounced, the company separated at about ten o'clock.—*Corrected from the Wakefield Express, Oct. 18.*

PROCEEDINGS OF THE COMMITTEE OF
MANCHESTER NEW COLLEGE.

Manchester, Oct. 21, 1856.

My dear Sir,—May I request the favour of your giving a place in your next No. of the Reformer to the enclosed declaration from members of the Manchester New College Committee, as it has been called forth by the Address in your October impression.

I am, my dear Sir, yours very truly,
JAMES HEYWOOD.

Rev. R. B. Aspland.

We, the undersigned members of the Committee of Manchester New College, having seen the statement relative to the resignation of Professor G. V. Smith in the Inquirer of August the 9th, and the Address to that gentleman published in the Christian Reformer for October, desire to express our personal respect for Mr. Smith's character and attainments, and, notwithstanding our repugnance to making known the proceedings of the Committee except to the general body of Trustees, think it necessary to put on record the following facts: that the question of a change in the provision for Theological instruction in the College was discussed at *two* meetings of the Committee, at one or both of which all of us were present; that at the *first* of these a considerable majority would have pronounced in favour of Mr. Smith's resignation had the votes been called for; that three amongst us who attended that first meeting were absent from the second, in the conviction that the matter had been definitely settled on the first occasion; and that we all concur in the final vote of the Committee.

We feel, therefore, bound to declare that if all those members who took part in the proceedings had been afforded the opportunity of voting, the result would have shewn that the Committee was *not* equally divided in opinion upon the question.

JAMES HEYWOOD,
ROBT. N. PHILIPS,
S. D. DARBISHIRE,
ROBERT WORTHINGTON,
R. D. DARBISHIRE,
EDMUND GRUNDY,
J. H. HUTTON,
CHARLES BEARD,
JOHN WRIGHT,
JOHN BOOTH,
JOHN EDWARD TAYLOR.

OBITUARY.

THE LATE MR. BENJAMIN GASKELL.

Copy of inscription on a simple mural tablet just erected in the Thornes-House family pew in the Westgate chapel, Wakefield. The tablet is of white marble on black, surmounted with the family crest and motto, "Scio cui credidi."

TO THE
HONOURED AND LAMENTED
MEMORY OF
BENJAMIN GASKELL, ESQ.,
OF THORNES HOUSE,
FOR MANY YEARS
ONE OF THE REPRESENTATIVES IN PARLIAMENT
OF THE BOROUGH OF MALDON,
BORN FEB. 28TH, 1781,
DIED JAN. 21ST, 1856.

LIBERAL, COMPASSIONATE, SINGLE MINDED,
GENTLE, UNASSUMING, TRUE,
HE WAS HELD
IN RESPECT AND AFFECTION
BY ALL WHO KNEW HIM
DURING A LONG AND BLAMELESS LIFE.
THIS TABLET IS ERECTED
BY HIS SORROWING AND LOVING SON.

Aug. 16, at her house in Rodney Street, Liverpool, in her 89th year, Mrs. PHOEBE HEYWOOD.

Aug. 20, at Hythe, after sixteen years of severe suffering, borne with Christian fortitude, ELIZABETH, the beloved wife of Thomas REES, LL.D.

Aug. 20, at Ashton-upon-Mersey, in the county of Chester, aged 23 years, Mr. JOHN DEAN, organist of Cross-Street chapel, Manchester.

Aug. 30, at Boston, Lincolnshire, in his 82nd year, Mr. W. GARFIT. The tribute to his memory which follows, is taken from a very able local paper, entitled the "Boston and Lowth Guardian."

It becomes our painful duty to record, in our impression of to-day, the decease of our much revered townsman, WILLIAM GARFIT, Esq. Although somewhat sudden at the last, the melancholy event had been for some time anticipated by himself, his family and the public. Returning home ill, from a visit to the metropolis in the latter part of May, he had never recovered from the blow which that illness

inflicted on his constitution. The symptoms which usually attend the "decline of life" somewhat rapidly presented themselves. While his mental faculties were all clear about him, his physical powers gradually succumbed beneath the pressure of accumulated years; till, on Saturday morning last, sitting, we believe, in his accustomed chair, he quietly, silently, and without pain or struggle, "passed away."

Mr. Garfit had arrived at a "good old age," having numbered over eleven years more than the "threescore years and ten" supposed to bound the life of man. He was born in Boston in June, 1775. Somewhere about his fourteenth year he was sent to the College at Hackney, then newly established, to complete his education. The celebrated Dr. Price, Dr. Rees and Mr. Belsham were the founders and managers of the institution; and Mr. Garfit, in addition to the inestimable advantage of the instructions of a man like Dr. Price, had also the privilege of listening to the course of lectures on "History and general Policy," and on "Experimental Philosophy and Chemistry," which Dr. Priestley delivered to the students of that College. His connection with these worthies of a former generation was one of the most cherished reminiscences of Mr. Garfit's life. Down to his dying day he was always ready and happy to speak of them, and to a sympathizing listener was never tired of recounting his vivid impressions of the persons, the teaching and preaching of these two great and venerated men.

From Hackney Mr. Garfit returned to Boston, and, we believe, in 1796, took his place in the bank. For over sixty years he was entirely and unremittingly occupied in that business. Under his successful management, the firm of "Garfit and Co." rose to be the first and most influential banking business in the county of Lincoln. Through the most trying times his bank always stood firm. Neither of the great monetary crises had any other effect than to increase its stability and augment its influence. During the great bank failures of 1814, when a perfect panic spread through the whole country, and three banks in the town of Boston,—Barnard and Sons, Sheath and Sons, and Edward Wilford—succumbed to the pressure, Mr. Garfit's shewed no signs of instability, and came out of the

crisis stronger than before. And in the panic of 1825, when another bank failed in Boston, Messrs. Garfit's credit was not even shaken, and the most panic-stricken of the public scarcely ventured to express a fear of its firmness. Mr. Garfit was quite old-fashioned in his habits. Though always wealthy, he was always at his post. He had never been out of England, never was much away from home, and so thoroughly was he identified with his business, that though he had long given up the management of it to his sons, he still, up to the last, occupied his accustomed place, and busied himself with his accustomed duties.

In his political opinions Mr. Garfit was a Whig. In the old times when Whiggery was as unfashionable as extreme Radicalism now is, Mr. Garfit stood by the Whigs (then the popular party), and he did not abandon them when, having passed their culminating point, they became unpopular and neglected. He was always the principal supporter—almost the creator—of the Orange interest in Boston. In 1818, his exertions returned the Hon. Mr. Burrell (now Lord Willoughby d'Eresby), who sat for many years; after him Sir. G. Heathcote (now Lord Aveland) was returned by the same interest, and represented the borough until the passing of the Reform Bill in 1832. In 1847, Mr. Garfit was the proposer and principal supporter of the Hon. Captain Pelham, brother of the Earl of Yarborough, who was returned by an immense majority. In 1852, he gave like efficient support to Mr. (now the Hon.) G. H. Heathcote, who, it will be remembered, having resigned in the spring of this year, was succeeded by our present member, Mr. Herbert Ingram, who also received Mr. Garfit's good wishes and influence, if not his active support. Mr. Garfit's decease is a considerable loss to the old Orange party in the town.

In his religious principles Mr. Garfit was an Unitarian, and one of the principal supporters of the Unitarian chapel in the town, which he regularly attended on Sunday mornings, down to the 18th May last, the eve of his departure on his last journey to London. But though clear and decided in his religious convictions, he was perfectly unsectarian in his sympathies, and was ever ready to extend a helping hand to every religious denomination, convinced that all had their work to do and all filled their sphere, however removed it might be from his own. Nor was his practice of Christian duties and his exhibition of Christian principles less conspicuous than his

liberality of feeling. "The greatest of these is Charity;" and charity in every beautiful form that charity can take was his especial characteristic. He was a most liberal supporter of every movement—educational, philanthropic, religious—which tended to human advancement, amelioration and enlightenment. He was emphatically a "Christian philanthropist." Poverty never appealed to him in vain—want and suffering were never sent empty away. A true child of Him who "makes His sun to shine on the evil and on the good, and sends His rain on the just and on the unjust," he was impartial as he was bountiful in the distribution of his charities. The friend of all—the enemy of none, he needs not we should speak his praise. The deep regret—the tears, and sympathy, and prayers—that alike from young and old, from rich and poor, follow him to his grave, are testimonials to his worth more eloquent far than any words that we could use. His monument is all around us in the hearts of his fellow-townsmen, who all feel that they have lost a friend. "Full of age and of honour," he has gone to his rest and his reward—but "his good deeds live after him," a richer heritage to his descendants than his wealth, and a lesson, a pattern, an encouragement to us all.

On Sunday evening, Sept. 7th, the Rev. P. W. Claydon preached the funeral sermon to a crowded and even overflowing congregation, from Job v. 26, "Thou shalt come to thy grave in a full age, like as a shock of corn cometh in in his season." The impression produced was, it is believed, beneficial. Many heard Mr. Claydon on that occasion who had never before entered an Unitarian chapel. Mr. Claydon took the opportunity of replying to the common taunt that "the Unitarian faith may do to live by, but not to die by." In Mr. Garfit the Unitarian cause in Boston has lost one of its most liberal supporters, but the Unitarians of the town are not by any means anxious about the future.

Aug. 30, at Dover, aged 66 years, PRISCILLA, relict of the late P. E. FORDHAM, Esq., C.E.

Sept. 2, at Chowbent, aged 55 years, MARY ANNE, elder daughter of the late Rev. B. R. DAVIS, many years minister of the Unitarian congregation in that place.

Sept. 2, at Clevedon, Somerset, ROBT. HENRY, the infant son of Mr. J. C. CONWAY, of London.

Sept. 12, at Sunderland, WILLIAM BRAITHWAITE, grocer, aged 60 years.

Sept. 26, at Colyton, Devonshire, aged 25, LAVINIA, fourth surviving daughter of the late George Eyre POWELL, Commander, R.N.

Sept. 30, at Grosvenor Road, Birkenhead, aged 10 months, MARY, only child of Mr. William Alfred JEVONS.

Oct. 2, at Chesterfield, advanced in years, MARY, the wife of Mr. Thomas WOODHEAD, of Saltergate, Chesterfield.

Oct. 10, at Bath, aged 66, JOHN WOOD, Esq., Chairman of the Inland Revenue Board.

Oct. 11, at Somerton, Somersetshire, in the 65th year of his age, ALFRED ESTLIN, Esq., solicitor, last surviving son of the late Rev. Dr. Estlin, of Bristol.

Oct. 15, at his residence, Rusholme Hall, near Manchester, ROBERT ASHTON, Esq., in the 60th year of his age. He was the youngest son of a family who have identified their name with the manufacturing interest of Lancashire and Cheshire, and, together with his brothers, was always a supporter of Liberal politics. He was one of the Council of the Anti-Corn-Law League. He was interred in the burial-ground of the Gee Cross chapel, towards the erection of which he was one of the principal contributors.

MARRIAGES.

Aug. 21, at South Littleton, Worcester-shire, THOMAS PARK, Esq., staff surgeon and Knight of the Legion of Honour, to EMMA, daughter of the late Jeremiah LEES, Esq., of Kelsall House, Stalybridge.

Aug. 23, at Dob-Lane chapel, Failsworth, near Manchester, by Rev. A. Lunn, Mr. EDWARD ALLEN to Miss ANN PRESTWICH, both of Failsworth.

Aug. 26, at Hope-Street church, Liverpool, by Rev. James Martineau, JOHN BEEDAM, eldest son of the late Edward CHARLESWORTH, Esq., banker, of Leeds, to ISABELLA, daughter of David SMITH, Esq., of Liverpool.

Aug. 31, at Christchurch chapel, Banbury, by Rev. J. McDowell, Mr. WILLIAM SHRIMPTON to Miss MARY ANN PAYNE, both of Banbury.

Aug. 31, at the Presbyterian chapel, Stourbridge, by Rev. John Dendy, B.A., Mr. S. HARLEY COX to Miss ANN DRURY.

Sept. 6, at Worship-Street chapel, by Rev. William Vidler, Mr. WILLIAM HARRISON to MARY ANN BURRIGE, both teachers at the Domestic Mission, Chapel Street.

Sept. 8, at the Stockport Unitarian church, by Rev. James Bayley, Mr. WILLIAM HENRY MATHER to Miss SARAH BROWN.

Sept. 14, at the Stockport Unitarian church, by Rev. James Bayley, Mr. JOHN HENRY COHOON to Miss ANN MIDDLETON.

Sept. 21, at the Stockport Unitarian church, by Rev. James Bayley, Mr. WILLIAM ROYLE to Miss CATHARINE LAWTON.

Sept. 24, at the First Presbyterian meeting-house, Belfast, by Rev. J. Scott Porter, THOMAS GARRETT, Esq., of Belfast, to MARY, only daughter of William BURDEN, Esq., M.D., Professor in Queen's College, Belfast.

Oct. 1, at Halesworth, Rev. THOMAS COOPER, minister of the Old meeting, Framlingham, to PHEBE, only child of the late Abraham CARMAN, of the same place.

Oct. 5, at the Old meeting, Bessel's Green, near Seven-oaks, by Rev. John A. Briggs, Mr. JAMES HEAD to MARY, daughter of Mr. Daniel HOBBS.

Oct. 11, at the Stockport Unitarian church, by Rev. James Bayley, Mr. WILLIAM BROOKS to Miss ELIZA FIDLER.

Oct. 19, at Bank-Street chapel, Bolton, by Rev. Franklin Baker, M.A., Mr. HENRY BROUGHTON to ESTHER MARIA, daughter of Mr. Thomas KENYON, Jun., both of Bolton. This being the first marriage in the new chapel, the minister presented the parties with a Bible.

Oct. 25, at the Old chapel, Dukinfield, by Rev. R. Brook Aspland, M.A., Mr. WM. ENGLAND to Miss KITTY BRIDGE, both of Ashton-under-Lyne.